This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Per. 971 e. 44
N.S. 29

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE

CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

A

Quarterly Review.

VOL. XXIX.

JANUARY—JUNE.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY J. & C. MOZLEY,
6, PATERNOSTER ROW;
AND D. APPLETON & CO. 348, BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

1855.

Digitized by Google

LONDON:
R. CLAY, PRINTER, BREAD STREET HILL.

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS

OF

No. LXXXVII.

PAGE

ART. I.—1. Georg Calixtus und seine Zeit. Von Dr. Ernst Ludwig Theodor Henke: ord. Prof. der Theologie zu Marburg.

2. Geschichte der synkretischen Streite in der Zeit G. Calixts. Von H. Schmid.

&c. &c. 1

II.—1. Of the Plurality of Worlds: An Essay.

2. More Worlds than One. By Sir David Brewster.

&c. &c..... 50

III.—1. Ueber das Verhaltniss des Islams zum Evangelium. Von Dr. J. A. Möhler. Ed. Döllinger.

2. Essai sur l'Histoire des Arabes avant l'Islamisme, pendant l'Epoque de Mahomet, et jusqu'à la réduction de toutes les tribus sous la loi Musulmane. Par A. P. Caussin de Perceval, Professeur d'Arabe au Collège de France, &c.

&c. &c..... 83

IV.—Selections, Grave and Gay. By Thos. De Quincey. From Writings published and unpublished 155

Digitized by Google

PAGE

ART. V.—First Report of the Cathedral Commissioners: Replies from the Heads of Houses and Professors at Oxford and Cambridge 192

NOTICES OF BOOKS 215

TITLE-PAGE AND INDEX TO VOL. XXVIII.

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS

OF

No. LXXXVIII.

PAGE

ART. I.—Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman, depuis son Origine jusqu'à nos Jours. Par J. de Hammer. Traduit de l'Allemand sur les Notes et sous la Direction de l'Auteur. Par J. J. Hellert..... 225

II.—The many Mansions in the House of the Father, scripturally discussed, and practically considered. By G. S. Faber, B.D., Master of Sherburn Hospital, &c.; with a Prefatory Memoir of the Author. By Francis A. Faber, Rector of Saunderton, Bucks. 310

III.—1. First Report of Her Majesty's Commissioners, appointed Nov. 10, A.D. 1852, to inquire into the State and Condition of the Cathedral and Collegiate Churches in England and Wales. Presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty. 1854. With an Appendix.

2. Cathedral Reform. A Letter to the Members of his Diocese, from Walter Kerr, Bishop of Salisbury, &c..... 332

Digitized by Google

PAGE

ART. IV.—1. An Inquiry into the Principles of Church-authority; or, Reasons for recalling my Subscription to the Royal Supremacy. By R. I. Wilberforce, M.A.

2. Papal Supremacy tested by Antiquity. By the late Rev. James Meyrick, M.A..... 369

V.—1. A Scripture Argument against permitting Marriage with a Wife's Sister—a Clergyman's Letter to a Friend. By the Rev. James Augustus Hessey, D.C.L., &c. &c. Second Edition.

2. The Report of Her Majesty's Commission on the Laws of Marriage, relative to Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, examined in a Letter to Sir Robert Harry Inglis, Bart. M.P. By Alex. J. Beresford Hope, M.P. Second Edition.

3. Against Profane Dealing with Holy Matrimony, &c. &c. By the Rev. John Keble, M.A., Vicar of Hursley 458

NOTICES OF BOOKS 478

Digitized by Google

THE

CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

JANUARY, 1855.

ART. I.—1. *Georg Calixtus und seine Zeit.* Von Dr. ERNST LUDWIG THEODOR HENKE: ord. Prof. der Theologie zu Marburg. Erster Band. Halle. 1853. [George Calixtus and his Times. By Dr. E. L. T. Henke, Prof. of Theology at Marburg. Vol. I. (1576—1635.)]

2. *Geschichte der synkretischen Streite in der Zeit G. Calixts.* Von H. SCHMID. Erlangen. 1846. [History of the Syncretical Contest in the time of Calixtus.]

3. *Georg Calixt und der Synkretismus.* Von W. GARS. Breslau. 1846. [George Calixtus and Syncretism.]

4. *Codex Liturgicus Ecclesiæ Universæ in Epitomen redactus.* Tom. II. Ecclesia Lutherana. Curavit H.A. DANIEL, Phil. D. Societ. Hist.-Theolog. Lips. Sodalis. Leipsic. Weigel. 1848.

5. *Historia Ecclesiastica Islandiæ.* Auctore P. PÉTURSSON, Lic. The. Toparchiæ Snæfelnesensis et Hnappadalensis Præposito, pastore Stadastadensi. Copenhagen. Luno. 1841.

6. *Die ursprüngliche Gottesdientsordnung in den Deutschen Kirchen Lutherischen Bekenntnisses, ihre Destruction und Reformation.* Von D. Th. KLIEFOTH, Superintendenten, und erstem Dom Prediger zu Schwerin. Rostock. 1847. [The Original System of Divine Services in the German Churches of the Lutheran Confession, its Destruction and Reformation. By D. Th. Kliefoth.]

7. *Den Danske Kirkes Historie efter Reformationen.* Ved LUDV. HELWEG. Tom. I. II. Kjobenhavn. 1851. [The History of the Danish Church after the Reformation. By L. Helweg. Copenhagen.]

WE are about to turn a page of Ecclesiastical History,—we use that term in its largest sense,—which will disclose so large an amount of bitterness, rancour, and malice, that its spectacle would be well-nigh intolerable were it not for the zeal with

Digitized by Google

which some few of its most eminent men did, even in the worst of times, labour for peace. It is unnecessary, we hope, that we should commence by vindicating ourselves from the charge of sympathising any further with the Lutheran and Reformed [1] divines, of whom we are to write, than in their endeavours, however, and however necessarily, futile, to realize the blessing of the Peacemakers; superfluous to say that we would not sacrifice one grain of essential truth for an indefinite amount of peace;—or to protest with Bishop Andrewes, 'No *Pax in terris*, except it shall first be seen how it can stand with *Gloria in excelsis*.' But this may surely be understood, without our repeating it in every page;—and we wish the whole paper, like the bracketed part of a mathematical formula, to be influenced by this one paragraph, as that is by the symbols exterior to the brackets.

It will be necessary, in order that we should have a better understanding of the rise and progress of Syncretism, to give a glance over Europe, as it then lay divided between the Roman Church, rapidly recovering from the blow of the Reformation, the Lutheran body, torn into a thousand factions, and losing ground daily, and Calvinism, becoming, from the local religion of a petty state, a formidable rival to that Protestantism which, half a century before, had threatened to engulf Europe. Let us see under what auspices the seventeenth century opened.

Clement VIII. (Aldobrandini) filled the papal throne. His own sanctity of life, his friendship with S. Philip de Neri, the learning which was gathered round the Vatican,—Baronius, Bellarmine, Muretus, Cluvius,—a galaxy of talent,—raised the court of Rome to a position worthy of its renown. The good fruits of the improved discipline introduced by the Council of Trent became everywhere visible. If the 'most illustrious cardinals' had not altogether undergone that 'most illustrious reformation,' which Bartholomeu dos Martyres, Archbishop Primate of Braga, declared to be their due, at least the licence of the preceding century was over: and the names of Salviati, Santorini, and Como were great in their days, and are respectable in ours. Henry IV. of France abjured Calvinism: his kingdom began to breathe after the miseries of the civil wars; 'politics' became extinct; Huguenots declined in numbers and in influence; the fairest realm in the possession of the Roman Church, after trembling on the verge of disruption, returned to her allegiance. Marvellous energy in the propagation of the faith; in Japan, innumerable martyrs under the

[1] The reader must bear in mind that, throughou this paper, we shall use the words *Protestant* and *Reformed* in their correct sense: the former for the Lutheran, the latter for the Calvinistic body.

Digitized by Google

savage Taycosama: progress in Cochin China and the Corea: China itself invaded: the Philippines, and others of the southern islands, evangelised: zealous missionaries in Thibet: attempts, however fruitless, in Ethiopia;—discipline and zeal introduced in South America: Socinianism rolled back like a flood in Poland, Calvinism in Holland; Belgium and Bohemia, doubtful as yet, but soon to be brought over: liturgical learning awaking; ecclesiastical history explored; martyrologies, Acta Sanctorum, rituals, each energetically studied by its own investigators; the Scriptures and other works translated into tongues till then unknown; the writings of the Fathers explained with ponderous learning; reforms in religious orders; new bishoprics; residence enforced; six thousand monasteries established in the New World; priests pointed out that had baptized one, three, four, five, *seven hundred thousand* infidels!

We turn to Germany. Rodolph II., much more occupied with the calculations of Tycho Brahe and Kepler than with the government of his empire, was nevertheless a warm supporter of the Roman Church: William II., and his son, Maximilian of Bavaria, were renowned over Europe for their exemplary lives and their zeal in defence of the faith; Ferdinand, archduke of Styria, poured an army of Capuchins over his dominions, and thereby preserved them from the new doctrine. On the other hand, it is probably difficult to realize the barbarous grossness and wickedness which made the courts of the Lutheran princes dens of debauchery. Those petty German sovereigns had, no doubt, always set frightful examples of licence: but now all restraint was removed, and a door thrown open to the wildest excesses of the vilest passions. Conspicuous among these were the three Saxon brothers, Christian II., John George, and Augustus.

The bitter rancour subsisting between Lutherans and Calvinists, and again between moderate and high Lutherans, far exceeded the hatred borne by either towards Rome. The Protestants, under the lead of the Elector of Brandenburg and the princes of Saxony, held for the House of Austria and the ancient constitution of the empire:—the Reformed, acknowledging the Elector Palatine as their chief, depended on the alliance of Holland and England, and were for introducing a new Germanic polity. On the whole, during the seventeenth century, the latter advanced and the former lost ground. Maurice, Landgrave of Hesse Cassel, in 1604, John Sigismund, Elector of Brandenburg, in 1614, Henry, Duke of Saxony, in 1688, from Lutherans became Calvinists: Adolphus, Duke of Holstein, had done so at the commencement of the century, but that province did not follow his example: a great disposition towards

Digitized by Google

the same side existed in Denmark, but it was crushed by the deposition of Canute, so called Bishop of Gottenburg, in 1614. All these gains, however, were more than counterbalanced by the decline of the Reformed interest in France, after the capture of La Rochelle in 1628; and in England, consequent on the accession of Laud.

To understand the schisms which tore the Lutherans almost to pieces, we must go back. Towards the end of 1545, the excesses of their founder had reached a point which, even to Luther's warmest admirers, seemed almost intolerable. 'Blessed is the 'man,' wrote he, on the 25th of January, 1546, 'that hath not 'walked in the counsel of the Sacramentaries, nor stood in the 'way of the Zuinglians, nor sat in the chair of them of Zurich.' Those who are not acquainted with the last writings of this unhappy man will do well to attend to the following extract:—

'My little Paul, my little Pope, my little ass, gently, gently!—You are treading on ice: you will break a leg;—you will spoil your beauty, and every one will say, What devil is this Pope? Hollo! The little Popeling is spoilt. . . . An ass knows that it is an ass; a stone knows that it is a stone; and these asses of popelings know not that they are asses. . . . If I were master of the empire, I would do up the pope and his cardinals into one packet, and pitch them into the Adriatic; that bath would cure them, I will lay;—and JESUS CHRIST will be my backer.'

It must, therefore, have been with no small feeling of relief that all respectable Lutherans heard of the death of their chief, after a long agony, on the night of the 16th to the 17th of February, 1546, and that they installed Melanchthon in the vacant throne. Far more inclined than his master to what would afterwards have been called 'a liberal comprehension,' the new chief was gradually drawn more and more to the side of the Zuinglian reformation. For two years, however, he enjoyed an uninterrupted sovereignty; but on the publication of the 'Interim,' in 1548, that controversy broke out which shook the Lutheran body to its foundations. Maurice, Elector of Saxony, consulted the divines of Wittenberg and Leipsic on the possibility of complying with the new edict. Melanchthon replied, in the name of all, that in matters of an indifferent nature, obedience was due to the imperial decrees. Hence the *Indifferentist* or *Adiaphoristic* controversy. Flaccius Illyricus, with the doctors of Jena and Saxe Weimar, attacked, in the bitterest language, Melanchthon and all the Philippists; and to strengthen their theological position, caused such of their opponents as were within their power to be thrown into prison. To Melanchthon, who died in 1560, succeeded in the government of the Moderate Lutherans, or Saxon party, his son-in-law Peucer, who took another step towards Zuinglianism. The University of Wittenberg published in 1559 the principal works of Melanchthon,

Digitized by Google

under the title of the Misnian body of doctrine. In 1566, the Elector forbade all his subjects under severe penalties to attack anything contained in it, and condemned in the strongest language, as a pest to the Church, the opinions of the Illyricians, or rigid Lutherans. Encouraged by these proceedings, Peucer and his companions published, in 1571, the celebrated work called *Stereoma*, in which they openly contradicted Luther's doctrine regarding Consubstantiation, and the Person of our Lord. The whole Lutheran body raised an outcry against this production; and the Elector, frightened by the clamour, convened an assembly of doctors, at Dresden, and commanded them to approve a form of agreement then drawn up, in which the ubiquity of our Lord's Body was expressly denied. Such as demurred to setting their names to this document were imprisoned or banished. All this time the Elector intended to be a rigid Lutheran, and being profoundly ignorant of theology, thought that he was only carrying out the teaching of his master. When his eyes were opened, he convoked, at Torgau, another assembly of doctors, who drew up a form of Concord (*Concordien Formel*), designed as a means of restoring harmony among Lutherans, and as a protest against the heresies of the Reformed. This made the matter ten times worse than before. Although the Elector took care that the Formulary should be adopted in Saxony, it was rejected by the Lutherans of Sleswig, Holstein, Brunswick, Liegnitz, Pomerania, Hesse, Silesia, and others; Frederick II. of Denmark, as soon as he had read it, threw it into the fire. And even in Saxony it found violent opponents, notwithstanding all the Court influence and threats exerted in its favour. Finally, however, patience and perseverance prevailed; and at the present day this formulary is added by most Lutheran communions to the Confession of Augsburg, and to the Articles of Smalcald.

On the death of the Elector Augustus and the succession of Christian I. the followers of Peucer and Melanchthon resumed their endeavours. Crellius, the prime minister of that prince, a secret Calvinist, especially exerted himself in the cause. But he had better have remained quiet: Christian I. died; and his minister was executed for his attempt to introduce a new reformation. Let the reader now remember the continual boast which prejudiced writers make about liberality, and hatred of persecution, and agreeing to differ—and then compare them with the banishments, the executions, and the tortures which Illyricians inflicted on Philippists, Zuinglians on both, and Anabaptists on all. It is really wonderful that men like Milner,—who, if they had ever opened one of the books which they

Digitized by Google

pretend to quote, must have been acquainted with these things,—could have had the brazen effrontery to speak of the German Reformation as introducing peace on earth and goodwill towards men. Take, for example, these instances; which indeed are almost too shocking to relate, and which far surpass all that the most frantic Protestants have ever feigned or dreamt of the Inquisition. We ought really to apologise for obtruding such horrors upon our readers; but, as party historians have, for the most part, so carefully concealed them, it may not be amiss to drag one or two out to light.[1] In the principality of Anspach, which then probably did not contain more than a hundred thousand souls, between 1575 and 1603, more than 1441 persons were put to the torture, and 474 executed, either by the gallows, the wheel, or the stake. Henry, Duke of Brunswick, burnt so many of his subjects for religious offences, and especially for sorcery, that the neighbourhood of Wolfenbüttel is recorded to have resembled a forest, from the number of stakes erected. At Brunswick, in 1603, a captain, by name Brabant, was excommunicated by the Lutheran preachers. Knowing the fate that was likely to await him, he endeavoured to make his escape, but happening to fall, broke his leg and was taken. He was put to the torture three times, his broken leg included. Finally, his fingers being cut off, his chest was, to use the expression of a contemporary historian, 'gently broken with a mallet,' his heart was cut out, and his body divided into five pieces. On Michaelmas-day, the preachers, in every church of the town, defended and applauded this barbarity; and, on the 9th of the following December, *a public thanksgiving was ordained in recognition of the mercy of God manifested in it.* The Lutheran inquisitors were in the habit of ordering in wine and dessert, while the tortures were going on; and more than one instance is recorded in which, while the sufferer, in the midst of his agony, was shrieking out for a cup of water, and adjuring his tormentors by the Wounds of our Lord not to deny it him, the judges, seated at the end of the rack, were pledging one another in good Rhenish wine, and making themselves merry with the

[1] If any one wishes to inquire at length into these terrible proceedings, and to satisfy himself that the very genius of the German Reformation was to be cruel, he has only to read the '*Historia Ecclesiastica et Heretica*' of Godfrey Arnold, himself a Lutheran, especially part ii. chap. 17. There he will find the most barbarous punishments to have been of every-day occurrence in the Lutheran states of Germany; nothing, for example, more common than to find a woman sentenced to have her breasts cut off, and then to be drowned, or burnt, or buried alive. No English review could possibly admit, even under the decent veil of a learned language, and in a note, half the atrocities legally perpetrated during that execrable period of German history.

Digitized by Google

eries of the tortured man. At the execution of Grumbach and the Chancellor Bruck, which took place at Gotha in 1567, and which, in the details of its cruelty (here quite unrepeatable), far surpassed that which we have just mentioned, a zealous Lutheran was so much edified by the procedure, that he bought the scaffold, dripping with blood, and converted it into the floor of his usual sitting-room. These are but two or three instances, out of many thousands; and so much for Protestant humanity.

It is not wonderful that men should have risen up who were determined to spend and to be spent in putting a stop to such horrors, and in bringing about a union, first, between the Lutherans and the Zuinglians; and then, if it were possible, between both and the Roman Church. Their endeavours, fruitless as they were, are neither uninteresting nor uninstructive; and to them we propose to devote the following paper. Out of the number who laboured in the same cause, two will deserve our more especial attention, John Dury, and George Calixtus. The life of the former has never yet been written at length, and we must do as well as we can, from an examination into his own pamphlets, most of them very scarce, and into those local histories of the Lutheran communion which relate his exploits. The biography of Calixtus has been more than once compiled. A very full and accurate account is to be found in the '*Cimbria Literata*' of John Moller (vol. iii. pp.121—210). A still more complete and able life is that which stands at the head of this article, and of which the first volume only has as yet appeared. Dr. Henke does not confine himself to the subject of his biography alone; he gives a sketch of the general state and condition of the Protestant and Reformed communions during the period of which he writes; and devotes a very interesting book to the foundation and progress of the University of Helmstädt, of which Calixtus was the most famous son, and which, at a later period, distinguished itself by its celebrated resolution in favour of the Roman Church. But, first, it will be expedient that we should point out the outward circumstances which seemed to render a reconciliation between Rome and the Lutherans not at all improbable. To do this, we must consider in what state Lutheranism found itself on the death of its first teacher. Such a consideration ought to be more especially interesting to us, on account of the remarkable contrast which the annals of that communion present to the history of our own Church. Every step made by the former has been in a downward direction; every step taken by the latter has been, through God's goodness, a return to better things.

It pleased an English prelate, some time since, writing on

Digitized by Google

what he called *pictorial Crucifixes*, to praise the great simplicity of the Protestant communion on the continent. Let us see in what that simplicity consists. Following Dr. Daniel, in the very able work which stands fourth in our list, we will give a glance at the rites and ceremonies which the Lutheran retained from the older religion,—and will begin with the fabrics of its churches.

Every one who has travelled in Germany knows to what a remarkable extent Lutheran resemble Roman Catholic churches. No general order was ever issued for the removal of the altars; —and in many states, as generally throughout Saxony, all remain. It is more common, however, to find either one, as with us, or two. Where there are two, the high altar, used only on the greatest festivals, retains its ancient position; the inferior altar stands at the entrance to the choir. S. Sebaldus at Nüremberg is thus described by a recent traveller:—

'The most remarkable thing is the Catholic aspect still preserved by its Lutheran holders. The choir retains its double stalls, its altar, vested in purple, and with four candlesticks, the exquisite rood, with S. Mary and S. John, and the bronze shrine of S. Sebaldus. The whole church is studded with altars, still vested, and adorned with lights; and near the empty tabernacle, a lamp still burns continually. I chanced to reach Nuremberg on the feast of S. Sebaldus. The church was crowded, every altar lighted, and the shrine and altars garlanded with flowers. It was a very singular exhibition of Protestantism.'[1]

As is well known, the crucifix and the images of saints have always been retained; and where wanting, supplied. So Luther himself expressly ordered.[2] It is true that, among these images, those of Luther, Melanchthon, John Huss, and Jerome of Prague, are often to be seen; and, in Denmark, it is not unusual that a pastor and his wife, who have distinguished themselves by any benefaction to the parish, should be commemorated in a similar way on the rood screen. So universal is the use of images, that Thiersch, in his work called, '*Vorlesungen iiber Catholicismus und Protestantismus*,' has an eloquent passage in which he endeavours to prove that Lutheranism has been, no less than the Roman Church, the parent of art.[3] Although in Germany the ancient vestments have long since become obsolete, they are retained, as is well known, in Denmark, and, to a still greater degree, in Sweden and Norway. Add to which, that the altar is everywhere the central point of devotion; that reading-desks and their adjuncts are utterly unknown; and that, whether during prayers, or at the so-called

[1] Webb's Continental Ecclesiology, p. 106.
[2] Works, (which we always quote from the edition of Walch,) vol. v. p. 1574, and vol. xx. p. 212.
[3] Vol. ii. p. 315.

Digitized by Google

Eucharist, the eyes and hearts of the people are directed as in Catholic times. It has more than once happened to the writer on first entering a church in a country of mixed religion, such as Westphalia, to go round it before he could make up his mind whether it were Lutheran or Catholic.

The early service books retain, to a most remarkable degree, the features of the older system. For instance: a book now lying before us, published in Upsala in 1620, that is, when Sweden was the leading Protestant power of Europe, bears this title, '*Liber cantus, in quo glorificationes, hoc est Kyrie et Venite, 'nec non sequentiæ ac antiphonæ in summis et simplicibus festis, 'atque diebus dominicalibus usitatæ, continentur.*' The index is not less remarkable. It begins thus: '*Kyrie dominicale: Kyrie 'in summis festis: in simplicibus festis: Kyrie Paschale: Kyrie 'Pentecostes: Lætabundus in summis festis,*' &c. &c. In some cases, the *Te Deum*, the *Kyrie*, and the *Agnus Dei*, are given in Swedish; in others, as is the case universally with the *Venite*, in Latin. The melodies throughout are of the severest and best Gregorian character; the words of the antiphons are, for the most part, unaltered, even where bearing reference to facts not recorded in Holy Scripture; for example: '*Dum 'præliaretur Michael Archangelus cum Dracone, audita est vox 'dicentium, Salus Deo nostro: Alleluia.*—Dixit Dominus,' &c. in the first tone. In one or two instances, the original words have been somewhat amusingly changed. For example, we read, 'Archangele Christe per gratiam quam meruisti, depre-'camur te Unigenitum Dominum nostrum, ut eripias nos de 'laqueis mortis; Alleluia.—*Mijn siål prijsar,*' &c. which is a good example of the manner in which Latin and the vernacular were mixed up together. The case was the same all over Germany; so that there was here no outcry against a tongue not understanded of the people. There is, for example, a Psalterium, published by Lossus at Wittenberg, in 1575, with a preface by Melanchthon, which contains antiphons, hymns, carols, and sequences, all in Latin; and though some few were slightly altered by Urbanus Regius, the greater number are left untouched. A Protestant reader of the present day might be surprised to find as the antiphon to the Magnificat for the first Vespers of the Purification, '*Gaude Maria Virgo; cunctas hæreses sola interemisti;*' or, as the sequence for the Visitation, '*Ave preclara Maris stella, in lucem gentium Maria divinitus orta.*' The large antiphonal books in some of the Lutheran cathedrals are so very little changed from their predecessors, that only by referring to the title-page is it easy to fix their dates.

If greater havoc were made among the Lutheran festivals,

Digitized by Google

still these also maintained, in a high degree, their original character. Advent is still observed, not only by hanging the churches in black, by more frequent sermons, and in many places, as at Halle, by a particular chime of the bells; but also by the prohibition of marriages during that season. Thus, in the synodical statutes of Pomerania; 'by the consent of the 'most illustrious princes and orders, it was agreed that mar-'riages should not be celebrated from the first Sunday in 'Advent to the first Sunday after Epiphany; nor from Ash-'Wednesday to the Sunday *Quasimodo*. Pastors are charged to 'admonish their congregations with respect to these rules.' On Christmas Day, the old customs were kept up in the principality of Reuss as late as 1766: boys were dressed as angels, and represented in a dramatic way the appearance to the shepherds. So near Berlin, till 1784; and so at Halberstadt, if not till the present day, at all events till within the last twenty years, S. Stephen's, S. John's, and the Holy Innocents' Day, were celebrated; and so also, the Circumcision. Luther inveighs, after his coarse fashion, against those who direct their attention to New Year's Day, rather than to the Lord's Feast.[1]

The Epiphany, or as the Germans call it, *Three Kings' Day*, or *High New Year*, was held in the greatest honour till the middle of the eighteenth century. In Prussia, it was, by a royal edict of March 12th, 1754, transferred to the following Sunday. The example has since been followed in Brunswick, Hanover, and Saxe Weimar. In Denmark, the same thing was done, in 1770; Dr. Daniel is therefore mistaken in asserting that, in that kingdom, the Epiphany is still celebrated. Hence, in all the above-named rituals, results the absurdity that the following Sundays take their name from a festival which does not exist. An agitation has recently been commenced for the fixing a missionary feast (*Missions Fest*) on this day. In addition to Twelfth Night, many Lutheran bodies celebrate the Baptism of our Lord; some on the Sunday between the Circumcision and Epiphany; some on the first Sunday after Epiphany; and some, by an odd use, on the Sunday *Esto mihi*. It has also been proposed to add a *Feast of Holy Scripture*, but the proposal seems to have met with little acceptance.

Nor was Luther less strict in the observance of Lent; and he dwells more than once on the duty of fasting, and especially of abstinence from meat. Now, even among the strictest Lutherans, fasting is all but unknown. At the present day, however, all public amusements and balls are forbidden by

[1] Vol. ii. 293, and xiii. 275. 'Das Fest der Beschneidung Christi ist ein sehr tröstlich Fest, da mann billig Gott anloben und danken soll,' &c.

Digitized by Google

the Prussian civil law, on Ash-Wednesday. This day is nevertheless, in most Lutheran countries, utterly neglected; in the Danish Altar-Book, for example, it never seems to have had a place. Good Friday was almost lost; it was revived in Prussia in 1773, and since that time has been tolerably well observed. In most places, however, Maundy Thursday,—*Green Thursday*, as the Germans call it,—is the greater day of the two. The custom of washing the feet was kept up as late as the beginning of the eighteenth century. The Danish Altar-Book has Collect, Epistle and Gospel for the Thursday, but none for the Friday. Till the year 1700, the Passion of our Lord was usually sung in parts, as it is in the Roman Church; and in many Lutheran rituals, at the words, 'He gave up the ghost,' the people are directed to kneel for the space of a *Pater Noster*. This is now, we believe, utterly obsolete; but, in some parts of Germany, and especially in Saxony, it is the custom that after sermon, about three o'clock in the afternoon of 'Still Friday,' the bells should be tolled, while the hymn is sung,

'Nun giebt mein Jesus gute nacht.'

This is a very popular ceremony; and is called by the Saxon peasants, 'Ringing the Lord Jesus to the grave.' Easter Eve is nowhere celebrated; and Easter Day itself has retained no peculiar ceremonies. Low Sunday is usually set apart for Confirmation. Ascension Day is held in honour everywhere in Prussia: it was for some time translated to the next Sunday; but the people complained so bitterly, that the old practice was restored. Whitsunday is, as a popular festival, a greater favourite than Easter. In Whitsun week, it is really difficult to enter some of the railway stations on account of the innumerable boughs with which they are decked out. Even Corpus Christi, though Luther abhorred it, was retained in Brandenburg, almost down to 1600. Of the Sundays after Trinity, the tenth is appropriated to the Destruction of Jerusalem; and the last, at least in the principality of Waldeck, is called the Feast of the Last Day. In most Lutheran communions, the number of Saints' days has been exceedingly diminished. Those which were retained at first, in most places, were, in addition to the festivals which our own Prayer-book celebrates;—the Visitation; the Nativity; the Assumption of S. Mary; Lammas Day; the Decollation of S. John Baptist; the Transfiguration; S. Laurence; S. Nicolas; S. Catherine; S. Mary Magdalene; S. Elizabeth; and S. George. These have gradually disappeared, as have also the festivals of Apostles, some by popular disuse, some by royal edict. Thus, in Denmark, on the 26th of October, 1770, the following were abo-

Digitized by Google

lished: Holy Innocents' Day, the Epiphany, the Purification, S. John's, the Visitation, Michaelmas, and All Saints' Day; 'though,' says the decree, 'the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel of 'the last-named day shall be read and explained on the Sun-'day next after the first of November; and the Annunciation 'shall be celebrated on the fifth Sunday in Lent.' In Iceland, a very remarkable festival was abolished in 1744. It was called 'The Day of Vows;' had been instituted before 1222, and was intended as a time of supplication for the fruits of the earth, for good fisheries, and against the eruption of Mount Hecla. It was observed on the first Thursday after S. Joseph's Day (March 17th). When the island was suffering from famine and disease in 1756, the most earnest entreaties were addressed to Frederick V., that he would be pleased to allow the re-introduction of this day; but the petition was disregarded.

The Feast of the Reformation is celebrated in most Lutheran communions, though not on the same day. In Pomerania, the commemoration takes place on S. Martin's Day, in reference to the name of Martin Luther; in other states they prefer the vigil; one or two substitute this festival for Trinity Sunday; some prefer the Sunday after S. Giles's Day. In the seventeenth century, the celebration had almost died out, till John George II., Elector of Saxony, issued a strict edict for its celebration on the 21st of October. In Saxony, therefore, and among the Protestants of Bavaria and Austria, that is the day; the Lutherans of the two last-named countries celebrate additionally the *Feast of Toleration*, that is, of the concessions made with respect to their worship, by the Emperor Joseph. In Prussia, the festival had been forgotten, till the fervour of the so-called 'Society of Gustavus Adolphus' resuscitated it. It is there held on the Sunday after the 31st of October. In Denmark, strangely enough, it is substituted for All Saints; itself, as we have seen, transferred to the following Sunday. After the ordinary Collect, Epistle, and Gospel, follows a 'Commemoration of the reformation and doctrine, which the blessed Doctor Martin Luther, in the year 1517, began and pursued.' And this is the commencement of the prayer:—

'Almighty and merciful God and Father, we Thy poor children thank Thee with all our hearts that Thou hast mercifully upheld us to this day by thy manifold goodness, and especially that Thou hast given us Thy Son, our only Mediator, who hath gathered to Himself for ever, with the Holy Ghost, a holy Church and communion, in which Thy most holy name should be rightfully known, and worshipped in the true faith and holiness; to which end Thou hast so wonderfully at all times helped them that were desirous to know Thee, and did not obstinately reject that Thy mercy and loving-kindness; which Thou hast also shown in an especial manner, in that more than two hundred years ago Thou didst free Thy Christian

Digitized by Google

Church from Popish slavery and darkness, and didst let the light of Thy true gospel be so mildly (!) again kindled, by Thy true servant Dr. Martin Luther, and others who duly followed him in Thy holy and blessed word, as well in these realms and lands as elsewhere, widely and broadly around us.'

Doctor Daniel has the good taste to object to this celebration:—

'Quam sententiam ferret ipse Lutherus de festo reformationis, nescimus; ego quidem vehementer animi pendeo. Illa festivitas semper quandam speciem novitatis præbet: denique non confert ad pacem Christianorum reconciliandam, sed sæpissime iracundias commovet recentes, magnosque animorum motus.'

In Prussia, another festival was instituted in 1816, which proves the truth of Schiller's lines:—

> But still the heart doth need a language,—still
> Do the old instincts bring back the old names,
> And to yon starry world they now are gone,
> Spirits or gods, that used to share this earth
> With man as with their friend;—

the commemoration of the departed (*Todten Fest*) on the last Sunday after Trinity. This has given rise to bitter reproaches from the more rigid Lutherans. 'You neglect,' say they, 'the 'festival of Easter, and you obtrude upon us the Papist com- 'memoration of All Souls.' Nevertheless, the natural instinct of man—(that instinct which in so many parts of Germany, and in some remote districts of England, has led to the beautiful custom of leaving a vacant chair on the eve of All Saints, when the family closes in round the fire, for its departed members)—has been stronger than Lutheranism, and the *Todten Fest* is rapidly prevailing throughout Germany.

The Lutheran fast days depart more widely from the ancient Church order than any other part of their system. In one or two principalities, there is a monthly fast; in most, there are three penitential days, though the time of year selected for their observation differs widely. In Saxony, they are held on the Friday before the last Sunday after Trinity, and on the Friday after Reminiscere; in Mecklenburg-Schwerin, on the Friday after Sexagesima, on Good Friday, on the third Sunday after Trinity, and on the Friday before the first Sunday in Advent; in Mecklenburg-Strelitz, on the Friday after Reminiscere, and the Friday before the first Sunday in Advent; in Bavaria, on Sexagesima Sunday. In Prussia, the commemoration is made on the Friday after Jubilate (the third Sunday after Easter). 'Most certainly,' observes Dr. Daniel, 'if a 'prize were given for the discovery of the most inappropriate 'season for a time of penitence, the Prussian Church would,

Digitized by Google

'without any manner of doubt, be entitled to it.' Nor have the Danes much mended the matter. They celebrate their *Almindelig Bededag* on the Friday which follows the fourth Sunday after Easter, according to the institution of King Christian V., in 1686.

Without entering further into other Lutheran observances, such as auricular confession and absolution, exorcism and baptism, and the like, we have said enough to show how much external similarity there is between their rites and those of the Roman Catholic Church. So far as outward observances go, the gulf lies, not between Catholics and Protestants, (we use the latter word in the strict sense,) but between Protestants and Reformed. We must now for one moment glance at the ecclesiastical position of the latter.

Their communion may be conveniently divided into four portions; those of Scotland, France, Switzerland, and Holland: for the few German States, such as the Palatinate, which embraced this religion, were merely fac-similes of the Swiss movement. The three first named seemed to vie with each other in desecrating churches; the French Calvinist, for example, exulted in destroying the most undoubted relics, such as those of S. Martin; the Scotch, as every one knows, have (when not restrained by the law) reduced their ecclesiastical buildings to the level of pigsties; and the Swiss are not much better. Honourable exception must be made in favour of Holland. The Dutchman's two sacraments are, preaching and psalm-singing, and he shows his estimation of them by the magnificent pulpits and organs which abound in that country. The expense of such an organ as that of Haarlem, and of such pulpits as are to be found at the Hague, or Amsterdam, or Rotterdam, is hardly calculable. Not content with this, it has also pleased them to erect rood-screens at an almost fabulous expense; any one who has visited Holland will have been struck with the elaborateness and massiveness of the brass, which is their usual material. This, however, is the exception; the majority of European Calvinists have always delighted in making their churches as plain and as filthy as possible. While Lutherans never, for one moment, dreamt of reconsecrating Catholic buildings, Calvinists delighted to do so; and in some cases went through the same process with regard to churches which had been intermediately occupied by Lutherans. The political struggle between the two heresies was never more strikingly developed, than when the Calvinist Elector Palatine, son-in-law of our James I., went to take possession of his new kingdom of Bohemia. Acting upon the suggestions of his favourite preacher Scultetus, he tore down the images, and defaced the decorations, of the Lutheran

Digitized by Google

churches at Prague; and to the hatred of his tenets thereby engendered among that powerful body, may be, in a great measure, ascribed the loss of his kingdom. Any one who wishes to see this remarkable episode of ecclesiastical, as well as civil history, strikingly set forth, cannot do better than read Mr. James's romance of 'Heidelberg.'

But notwithstanding the fury of the contest between Lutherans and Reformed, there arose, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, more than one divine who was determined to reconcile the two bodies. Of these, the first, and deserving to be the most famous, was John Dury.[1]

John Dury, whose name was afterwards to be mixed up with the religious parties of Europe for nearly half a century, and who did and suffered more for the cause of peace—such as it was—than probably any other man, was born at Edinburgh,[2] towards the end of the sixteenth century. His father, of the same name, was an apostate monk, and became a celebrated preacher of the school of Knox, in that neighbourhood. Some

[1] The sources from whence the history of John Dury, better known by his Latin name of Duræus, may be learnt, are in part given by Mosheim, vol. v. p. 277: he has, however, omitted the most important of all; namely, the English writings of Duræus himself. Of these the following are most to our purpose: 1. A Brief Relation of that which hath lately been attempted to procure Ecclesiastical Peace among Protestants. Published by Samuel Hartlib. London. 1640. 2. A Summary Account of Master John Dury's former and latter Negotiations for the Procuring of true Gospel Peace, with Christian Moderation and Charitable Unity among the Protestant Churches and Academies. London: printed for the Author in 1657. These two are identical down to page 32 of the former, which is the same as page 23 of the latter. The 'Brief Relation' has three more pages, containing a sort of epilogue, which concludes that portion of Dury's labours. 3. The Unchanged and Single-hearted Peacemaker. London. 1650. 4. Consultationum Irenicarum *προδιόρθωσις*. Amsterdam. 1664. Of Biographies, the best are; 1. G. Arnoldus; *Historia Johannis Durœi*, an university thesis, delivered under the presidency of J. C. Kohler, and usually quoted as that of Colerus. Wittenberg, 1716. 2. Benzelius; *Dissertatio de Johanne Durœo, maximeque de Actis ejus Suecanis;* a thesis delivered before the celebrated Mosheim, and generally called from him. The proceedings of Durœus at Marburg are said to be related by Schenk in his *Vitæ Professorum Theologiæ Marburgensium*, page 207; but this book the writer has not been able to see. Jablonski has recorded his attempts in Prussia and Poland, in his *Historia Consensus Sendomiriensis*. His journeys in the Palatinate, Switzerland and Denmark are related in Seelen's *Deliciæ Epistolarum;* in the *Museum Helveticum*, and in the *Fasciculus Epistolarum Theologicarum* of Elswitch. Of all single works, that of Benzelius is incomparably the best; the thesis of G. Arnoldus, besides containing many mistakes, extends no further than to 1657, and is written in so flippant a style that it is a trial of patience to labour through it. Beside these, the present writer has examined more than twenty pamphlets of Durœus himself, from most of which something may be gleaned as to his personal history. Should any reader be curious enough to compare the account given in the text with those of Arnoldus and Benzelius, he may rest assured that any departure from their statements is based on the accounts of the subject of their biography, who must have been best acquainted with the details of his own life.

[2] Arnoldus tells us that he was a Scotchman; and adds 'Reliqua si desideres merum *σκότος*.' But the truth is, that John Dury, the father, was by no means an unimportant personage in his day.

Digitized by Google

political sermons of his having enraged the Government, he thought it prudent to fly into Holland, became a pastor at Leyden, and there spent the rest of his life. Here our hero was educated, embraced independent views, and, in 1628, settled as pastor to the English factory at Elbing, in Prussia. It was the period of that tremendous struggle between the Reformation and the Church of Rome, which, after promising to render the former triumphant throughout Europe, concluded by driving it back in all quarters, by cooping it up in countries with which, at the commencement of the century, it would have disdained to be satisfied, and by causing its great antagonist to make efforts which recalled her former struggle with the Emperors of the world, and to send forth saints who might rival the Gregories and the Leos of her earlier days. Sweden and Austria, the 'never-conquered king' and Oxenstiern on the one side, Wallenstein and Tilly on the other, fought out, so far as human arms were concerned, the contest. At that time Elbing formed part of the dominions of Gustavus Adolphus, and was the residence of Dr. Godeman, one of his privy counsellors. This person contracted an intimate friendship with Dury, and was the first to suggest to him that whoever should be able to bring to pass a general inter-communion throughout Protestant Christendom would indeed deserve the blessing of the peacemakers. This was the utmost pitch to which the imagination of the Swedish privy counsellor soared; it was that, also, which occupied the greater part of the life of Dury. For the second phase of these tendencies to reconciliation, that, namely, which included Rome in the general peace, had its rise, as we shall see, in George Calixtus, and did not occupy the mind of his predecessor till nearly the conclusion of his life. Dury instantly caught at the idea, and offered to devote himself to the work, if he could see any hope of being enabled to carry forward his scheme. It chanced that, at this period, Sir Thomas Rowe (whose history is so intimately mixed up with that of the celebrated patriarch of Constantinople, Cyril Lucar) was sent ambassador extraordinary to Gustavus, and happened to take Elbing on his way back to England. He heard of the plan from Dury, communicated it to the Chancellor Oxenstiern —perhaps, on the whole, the greatest man whom Sweden ever produced—and agreed with him in thinking that both Gustavus and Charles I. should render all the support that might lie in their power for so excellent an object. On his return to England, Sir Thomas communicated the proposals to several of his friends, by whom they were much relished; but by none more so than by the Lord Chancellor. This was in 1630; and by the advice of those interested in the matter, Dury was invited

Digitized by Google

to England: an invitation which he the more readily accepted, as his congregation at Elbing was now broken up, in consequence of the failure of its commercial proceedings. To England, therefore, Dury went, and was well received, not only by Archbishop Abbot, which, from the character of the man, we might have expected, but also by Laud, who then filled the chair of London. It was agreed that he should return to Germany, should see Gustavus Adolphus, and should concert such measures as might seem advisable to that monarch and to the other Protestant princes. Our divine, nothing loath, accepted the mission, and had his first interview with the king of Sweden at Würtzberg, in 1631. Gustavus, at this moment, was the dictator of Protestant Europe; the battle of Leipsic had laid Germany at his feet; Protestants and Reformers hastened to pour in their forces to his assistance; while the cruel sack and destruction of Magdeburg, by Tilly, stirred up a warm feeling of execration against the Catholic leaders.

Such, then, was Gustavus when Dury, fortified with a letter of recommendation signed by thirty-eight English divines, presented himself at the court. The king heard him with interest, and offered to furnish him with letters patent, recommending his person and his design to all the Protestant princes. The negotiator, however, had, singularly enough, some objection against receiving such a document from any but an ecclesiastical authority; he asked leave to decline it for the present; and all that was settled was a recommendation to the divines of the various sects to prepare the way by their sermons for a general peace. Having thus made a beginning with the Lutherans, Dury thought it expedient to try his success among the Calvinists; he therefore visited in order Hanau, the Palatinate, the Duchy of Zweibrücken, and the Wetterau.

Whether it were the interest which Dury had excited, or whether the Lutherans and Calvinists felt that their only hope of success lay in union, can hardly be determined; but on the 3d of March in this same year, a colloquy between the Protestants and the Reformed had been held at Leipsic. The fairest professions were made on either side. The Confession of Augsburg was perused and reperused; but no substantial step was taken. The conference, however, served to furnish our pacificator with another, among the many documents which he always carried about with him.[1]

But, in the meantime, the fortunes of his great patron had changed. Schiller tells the story in brief:—

[1] An account of this Synod is given by Sagittarius in his Introduction to Ecclesiastical History, vol. ii. p. 1588.

Digitized by Google

> Bohemia was deliver'd from the Saxons,
> The Swede's career of conquest check'd. These lands
> Began to draw breath freely, as Duke Friedland
> From all the streams of Germany forced hither
> The scatter'd forces of the enemy;
> Hither invoked, as round one magic circle,
> The Rheingrave, Bernhard, Bannier, Oxenstiern,
> Yea, and the never-conquer'd king himself:
> In Nürnberg's camp the Swedish monarch left
> His fame—in Lützen's plains, his life.

With Gustavus, on that 6th of November, 1632, fell Protestant ascendancy; and the Schwedenstein, which marks his resting-place on the field of Lützen, may also be regarded as the boundary-stone which proclaims, 'Thus far shalt thou go, but no further,' to the conquests of Lutheranism. It was in the Wetterau that Dury heard of the great event; and he thence wrote to Abbot and to Laud, acquainting them with what he had already performed, pledging himself to more extended efforts, and imploring further assistance. He thence went to a general meeting of Protestant states at Heilebron, in company with Sir Robert Anstruther, who was to represent England in the assembly. By this time, considerable interest was felt throughout Europe; friends to the cause sprang up everywhere; the most distinguished were the Swiss, John Millet, the Frenchman, Anne Coligny, Paul Ferrius, of Metz, and John Matthiæ, Lutheran Bishop of Strengnås. Some of the legates at Frankfort had brought divines who promised to render all assistance; such were Dunner from Sweden, and Tettelbach from Frankfort. Our hero, who by this time repented of not having accepted the offer made by Gustavus, applied to Oxenstiern for a similar circular. The chancellor was more wary than the king, and declined setting his hand to any such document; he joined, however, with the other ambassadors in signing a more general paper, importing their wish for peace, their recognition of Dury's labours, and the esteem they felt for his character. They also promised to bring to a meeting of the States, which was to be held at Erfurt in the following spring, a divine or two from their respective kingdoms; and, in the meantime, to propose to their several communions the following questions:—1. Whether the acts of the Conference at Leipsic, in so far as they were agreeable to the Confession of Augsburg, might not be received by all? 2. Whether the disagreements existing between Lutherans and Reformed might be reconciled, yes, or no? If yes, how? If no, were the discrepancies such as necessarily to imply a schism between the two communions? With these documents, and a portmanteau full of other communications, especially from Paris, Geneva, and Metz, our pacifi-

Digitized by Google

cator, finding that nothing was likely to occur in Germany during the winter, took his way through Holland, calling on the chief pastor of every town through which he travelled, for the purpose of disseminating his own views, and arrived in England in the autumn of 1633. Here he found the face of affairs somewhat changed; Abbot was dead, and Laud had succeeded him at Canterbury. He, however, received Dury in a friendly manner, wrote him a courteous letter which has been printed by Benzelius, asked him to dinner at Lambeth, observed that he should have taken him for a German—by this time, according to every one's testimony, he spoke German more fluently than English—and finally inquired whether he were in orders, and if so, by whom they had been conferred? If we may believe Dury, he had been for several years under some scruple[1] with respect to the validity of independent Ordination; and if so, his expressions on the subject probably influenced the Archbishop in his favour. We say *if so*, because here, for the first time, the shifts and manœuvres which procured for Dury the titles of 'the double-faced Didymus,' 'the treacherous Ambidexter,' and other the like unsavoury appellations, begin to manifest themselves. The fact seems to be that he did not intentionally deceive; but, fully persuaded himself of the utter unimportance of all disputes about Church polity, and even about matters of faith not expressly laid down in the Apostles' Creed, and penetrated with a sense of the supreme importance of peace, he sacrificed not only rites and ceremonies, but weighty points of doctrine, sometimes asserting them, sometimes denying them, with an ease which seemed to those who did not regard the question from precisely his point of view, the grossest duplicity. His was not a candid mind; and though it would be difficult, and perhaps impossible, in any of his numerous works (we ourselves have seen more than twenty), to convict him of a deliberate falsehood through all the tangled skein of events which he relates, yet it must be confessed that he clips, and smooths down, and rounds off, and omits what was conveniently omitted, and exaggerates what it was expedient to exaggerate,—all, be it observed, in furtherance of his mission,—till some part of his history assumes a very different aspect, as related by him, from that which it bears in the accounts of his biographers.

But we are keeping our hero and the Archbishop waiting. 'By all means,' said the latter, 'consult Master Bray; he will give you full satisfaction on these points.' Bray, principally

[1] This is his constant assertion throughout 'The Unchanged and Single-hearted Peacemaker;' and as the statement could hardly have been calculated to procure him favour at the time when it was made, it may probably be true.

Digitized by Google

known to us as the licenser of divinity works at that time, and as the author of one or two pamphlets in defence of the tenets of the High Church party, bows, expresses his readiness to obey his Grace's injunctions, speaks of the pleasure which it had given him to make the acquaintance of so renowned a divine as Master Dury, and is certain that he shall be able to satisfy him with respect to any little points of discipline on which they may differ. Would Master Dury do him the honour of visiting him at his poor lodgings in Lambeth Palace on the following morning? Our hero assents, and the two become intimate. It is then suggested by his old friend, Sir Thomas Rowe, who is passing the winter in London, that his capabilities for action would be very much increased if he received orders in the English Church. 'As for the Church of England,' they are Dury's own words in 'The Unchanged Peacemaker,' 'I said that 'I did look upon it as a Church of Christ, true in respect of the 'doctrine professed therein, and eminent for all spiritual gifts 'bestowed upon it: that I judged the government thereof by 'bishops with indifference, and that I took them as men com-'missioned by the king to be his delegates.' It is certain that if he thus spoke to Sir Thomas, his communications to Bray were in another strain; but whatever they were, they satisfied him, and what was more to Dury's purpose, they pleased Laud. The Archbishop had the presentation to a living in Devonshire then vacant. He offered it to our negotiator. The latter declined it if it would have the effect of obliging him to residence. 'It shall not,' replied Laud; 'you shall have a licence 'of non-residence, and will thus be enabled to pursue your 'negotiations with the more effect.' Dury accepted the preferment, went down to Exeter, and was ordained priest by Bishop Hall, on Monday, S. Matthias's Day, 1634. Immediately afterwards it was found that the incumbent of the living to which he had been presented was alive; our pacificator, therefore, returned to London. This is his own account; and it must be confessed that one or two things related in it seem rather improbable.

He spent the winter in procuring further testimonials from English divines. Davenant, Bishop of Salisbury, Morton of Durham, and Hall of Exeter, the leaders of what we should now call the Low Church party, received him with open arms, and gave him all kind of certificates. From Bedell, Bishop of Kilmore and Ardagh, he received still more substantial tokens of approbation; that munificent prelate allowing him a pension during the remainder of his life. Archbishop Laud so far gave in to the scheme, as to write a kind of circular to Protestant pastors. Enriched with all these documents, Dury set forth in

Digitized by Google

the spring of 1634 to join Sir Robert Anstruther at Hamburg. With that statesman he proceeded to Frankfort, where the proposed meeting of Protestant States was held; with the divines in attendance on their respective ambassadors he had repeated conferences, and obtained from them a kind of circular to their brethren throughout Europe. Armed with this, which bears date September 14, 1634, he went back to England, where he arrived in what Laud calls 'the extreme hot and faint October and November, the leaves being not all off the trees at the beginning of December.' The Archbishop presented him to the king. In England he remained till the ensuing summer, and apparently, it would seem, visited Aberdeen and Edinburgh for the purpose of procuring from the divines of those places an adhesion to his plan of pacification. In July 1635, having gained all that he could expect from his English visit, he proceeded to the Netherlands, and presented himself at the provincial Synod of Holland. Here he endeavoured to interest all those who had any influence in ecclesiastical or civil matters; and this Synod being concluded, he appeared successively at those of Zealand, Leyden, and Utrecht. Whether among his other multifarious attainments he had acquired a knowledge of Dutch, we know not; but to judge from the facility with which, both now and at subsequent periods, he—to use his favourite expression—'dealt with' various high and mighty personages in Holland, it would seem that he had acquired their language. At all events, he spoke and wrote French like a native; and presenting himself to the Walloon Synod, he received from them warmer sympathy than he had met with in any other place. These proceedings took up about a year, and he then determined to visit Sweden, still, under the Chancellor Oxenstiern, the leading Protestant power. He arrived in that country in July 1636, visited in turn Stockholm, Upsala, Westerås and Strengnäs, and returning to Upsala endeavoured to interest the University in his plans. Not succeeding to his wishes, our indefatigable hero accompanied Oxenstiern in a tour through the whole kingdom. While these events were in progress, that State had lost the pre-eminence which, under Gustavus, it had acquired. Wallenstein had fallen, and the Catholic armies were under the command of the King of Hungary, eldest son to the Emperor. After he had obtained several brilliant successes, and had been reinforced by 20,000 men from Spain, he was attacked by the Protestant leaders near Nordlingen. The battle was one of the most obstinate which history records; but finally, notwithstanding the almost supernatural efforts made by the Swedes, the Protestant confederates were utterly defeated, and Sweden began its downward career among European nations.

Digitized by Google

Dury was now at Stockholm, where was a large meeting of Swedish divines. The main question, said they, is that of the Holy Eucharist; if the Reformed will agree with us in that, all will go well. And the pacificator endeavoured, by producing the documents which he had brought from Edinburgh and from Aberdeen, to show, that even between Lutherans and the most rigid of Calvinists, the question was only one of words. On the 7th of February, 1638, the assembled divines, as Dury tells us, agreed that his proposals were not such as could be accepted; he forgets or omits to mention that, on this day, a royal edict came forth to the following effect:—'It is the pleasure of Queen 'Christina that John Dury, a British preacher, who has resided 'in this country for some months, not without the great scandal 'of our ecclesiastics, should depart without any delay from this 'kingdom.' Our hero did so; but, from the chagrin consequent on this edict, he fell ill at Stockholm, and his life was for some time despaired of. While on that which promised to be his death-bed, he made a vow that, if he were spared, he would devote the remainder of his existence to the cause which he had already taken in hand; that he would spare neither time nor trouble in its prosecution; that he would not be turned aside from it by any motive whatsoever; and that he would very willingly spend and be spent, to the utmost, for its success. He recovered, and visited in turn Bremen, Stâde, Brunswick, and Lunenburg. Duke Augustus, of Brunswick Lunenburg, assembled a Synod of his divines to consult with the stranger; on their approval of the design, he gave him commendatory letters to his cousin, Duke Augustus, who resided at Hildesheim. By this prince he was even more favourably received. Another Synod was assembled, and Dury, with the other divines, was lodged and boarded for fourteen days at the duke's expense. It was here agreed that Calixtus—and this is the first time that his name occurs in Dury's history—should write in defence of the pacification, and that letters should be sent to the Lutheran Universities of Wittenberg, Jena, Leipsic, and Helmstädt; as well as to the States of Brandenburg, Hesse, and Bremen. This being settled, our pacificator betook himself to Duke Frederick, the brother of Duke George, who held his court at Zelle; his divines agreed to what had been done at Brunswick and Hildesheim. Armed with their recommendations, Dury proceeded to Glückstadt, to join his old friend, Sir Thomas Rowe,—a personage nearly as ubiquitous as himself,—by whom he was presented to the King of Denmark. In the meanwhile great disputes broke out at Hamburg and Lübeck, on the subject of the novel mission; having done what he could to pacify these, Dury visited Statius Buscherus, the

Digitized by Google

great opponent of Calixtus and himself, with whom, to use his own expression, 'he dealt.' Thence he went back to Stâde, and, as he says, 'insinuated some writings into the chief preacher of that place;' and from hence he sent a treatise written by Calixtus, into England. He went back again to Bremen, where he stayed fourteen days, and visited all the pastors in the town; crossed the country to Oldenburg, and had a long interview with the Superintendent; travelled through Hanover, and visited Emden; crossed the Dollart Gulf, entered Holland, disputed at Gröningen, and so made his way to Amsterdam; whence, by way of resting himself, he addressed letters to all the Presbyteries of North Holland, and, *viâ* the Hague, wrote to his friends in France. Thence he went into Zealand, and so returned to England, where he arrived in 1640. Here he found the division between the King and Parliament on the point of breaking out into open war; and all hope of obtaining fresh documents to be employed on his mission was at an end for the present. He seems, however, to have attached himself still to the King, who selected him as the tutor for the Princess Royal, at the Hague. In this office he remained till 1643, when he was summoned to the Assembly of Divines. The Prince of Orange would not allow him to accept the invitation: and other causes of disagreement occurring between them, Dury threw up the office, and became chaplain to the Company of Merchants Adventurers at Rotterdam. As the Assembly still continued to demand his services, he again returned to England, and we find him, November 20th, 1645, preaching before the House of Commons a sermon, which was afterwards published under the title of 'Israel's Call to come out of Babylon unto Jerusalem.' It is nowise to be distinguished from the lengthy discourses of the Calamies, the Youngs, and the Marshalls of the period; except that the ruling passion of the orator exhibits itself in the preface, where he sets forth the advantages which would arise to what he calls Jerusalem, and the heavy blow which would be inflicted on Babylon, if Protestant states and princes could be brought to agree.

Our hero's employment from 1645 to 1654 it is not easy to determine. He merely informs us that he was residing in England, 'promoting domestic peace,' and keeping up a foreign correspondence. It would seem, however, from a passage in the 'Unchanged Peacemaker,' that before 1650 he was married, and that his wife had considerable property in Ireland. As there is no trace of his marriage during the course of either his earlier or his later travels, it probably occurred during his present sojourn in England; and perhaps we shall not do him great injustice, if we imagine that the fortune of his wife

Digitized by Google

afterwards of great assistance to him in carrying out his plans, was one of his inducements to enter into a state for which his continued journeys must have rendered him very ill suited. It is a curious example of human inconsistency, that our pacificator, who was for unlimited liberality abroad, would have no such thing as toleration in his own country. In 1644 he published 'An Epistolary Discourse against Toleration,' addressed to Thomas Goodwin, Philip Nye, and his old and staunch friend, Samuel Hartlib. Four years later, he exerted his utmost efforts to save the King. Afterwards, as he had willingly taken the Covenant, he, with as little scruple, set his hand to the Engagement; hence, in 1650, he was attacked in a pamphlet entitled, 'The Time-serving Proteus, and Ambidexter Divine, uncased 'to the World.' To which he replied by the tract which we have so often quoted, 'The Unchanged, Constant, and Single-'hearted Peacemaker, drawn forth into the World; in a Letter to 'Samuel Hartlib, May 30th, 1650.' The war between England and Holland threw further obstacles in the way of Dury's designs; as soon as peace was made, he procured letters commendatory from Cromwell and from the principal divines in and near London, and again left England, April 5th, 1654. Having hitherto found greater success among Calvinists than among Lutherans, he determined on labouring in a hitherto untried portion of the same field. He reached Zurich on the 18th of May, and was delighted to find that a general meeting of the Protestant Cantons was to be held at Arau on the 13th of June. There he of course presented himself, 'dealt with' all the theologians who assembled in the place, and managed to procure from them a document in which they set forth what in their opinion was necessary to be done. Back he went to Zurich, in order to interest the civil authorities of that place. They recommended him to prosecute his endeavours at Berne; to Berne he accordingly betook himself, and thence to St. Gall and Basle. Hearing that the Reformed congregations among the Grisons were anxious to take part in the movement, he appointed a place where their deputies might meet him in safety; and to 'that place,' as he cautiously writes in 1657, he went in December, and spent one day in a satisfactory conference. Having thus shown his friends at Zurich that his scheme was likely to be taken up by the other Cantons, he repaired thither again; and, in a series of visits to Berne, Biel, Neufchatel, and Lausanne, he prosecuted his endeavours, besides, as he tells us, calling on the preacher of every considerable town in or near those places. He had not yet seen a city which must have excited his earnest veneration, Geneva. To this he had especial letters of recommendation from the Lord

Digitized by Google

Protector; and, as we learn from other sources, he here obtained a considerable sum of money in furtherance of the pacification.[1] On February 7th, 1655, he was at Berne again, 'where he stayed to print something, to be dispersed in France.' Another Synod at Arau gave him a second opportunity of meeting the assembled Swiss divines, when, finding that the cities of Zurich and Berne were not acting together with cordiality, this most indefatigable man posted to the former, 'where he stayed 'during March, April, and May, to expect the promised decla- 'ration of the Church, to print some preliminary information 'to be sent before into Germany, to settle the course for theo- 'logical correspondence, and to receive the answer of the Pro- 'testant cantons to his highness's letter.' Having achieved all that he thought possible in Switzerland, he set forward by way of Basle for Germany, intending to visit Heidelberg. But the Elector Palatine, he says, 'for some reason would not receive him;' that reason, of course, being that he was on terms of such intimate friendship with the murderers of the Elector's near relation, King Charles. He therefore went to Stüttgard, where he arrived at an unfortunate moment, as the duchess was on her death-bed; the duke, however, despatched some of his ministers to hear Dury's plan. It must be confessed that the general sentiments with which our hero was regarded in Germany were not favourable. Thus, a Lutheran nobleman[2] writes of him about this time: *Johannes Durœus, tum Lutheranos inter et Calvinistas inanis proxeneta, nunc vero inter Puritanos ubique et ipsos Independentes conator operosissimus*, &c. However, not discouraged, he again travelled through all the Wetterau, and attended a general meeting of Protestant deputies at Frankfort, July 1655. All this time he was keeping up a correspondence with Hottinger, the principal ecclesiastical authority of the Elector Palatine, whom he represents himself as having satisfied. Hottinger, himself anxious for a pacification, mentions Dury in his 'Meletemata Irenica,' but so as to show that he felt no great confidence in that divine's powers. Dury next entered the territories of the more insignificant German princes, and 'dealt with' the Counts of Yssenburg, Buddenheim, Solms, and the Prince of Nassau, as well as with the counsellors of the Count of Wetzenstein, who was the director of the circle of Wetterau. Thence, in October, to Marburg: his exploits in that place are related by Schenk, in his 'Vitæ Professorum Theologiæ:' so to Cassel; and so, in the beginning of 1656, to the princes of Anhalt: from him of Anhalt-Köthen (the German

[1] This part of Dury's history is also related by Gesselius, 'Historia Ecclesiastica,' ii. 773; and Ancillius, Mel. Crit. ii. 244.

[2] This is quoted in Struvius's 'Fasciculus ultimus Librorum rariorum,' p. 54.

Digitized by Google

traveller will remember the place from the great gambling-house which the present sovereign has erected close to the railway station) he received much encouragement. Thence to Weimar, and to Gotha, where he was closeted with the Duke Ernest from eight to twelve, and from two to six; a circumstance which he records with evident satisfaction. It would be endless to mention all the small principalities which he at this time visited. At length he seems to have pined for Holland, and found his way thither by Cleves and Nymeguen. When in the latter place, he heard that the provincial Synod of Harderwick was about to assemble; of course he went thither, and obtained a certificate from the divines there in consultation. Crossing the country to Alkmaar, he found the Synod of North Holland in session, but was less fortunate than usual in his reception, as the lay commissioners interfered, and would not allow him to speak. He therefore thought it necessary to go to the Hague, and to obtain from the States General such letters of recommendation as might obviate the like opposition for the future; these he procured, and forwarded them to the several provinces; and relying on the protection he had thus acquired, he presented himself in September to the Synod of Utrecht, to that of Middelburg, and to that of the Walloons. The latter being concluded—it is one little proof among many of the indomitable perseverance of the man—he went to Flushing, simply, as he says, 'to confer with some men of note who could contribute somewhat to the furtherance of his design.' He next heard that there was a meeting of divines at Bergen op Zoom; here he did what he could, and so was in time for the assembly of the States of Holland at Amsterdam. By them he was told that they could do nothing till they knew how far the Lutherans would be disposed to meet them. Dury immediately fell to work, and translated and printed such papers as he thought might obviate that difficulty; the declarations of Leipsic and Frankfort, a letter from the King of Sweden to one of his bishops, and some other documents. He now thought that he might hope to obtain some official recognition by the States General. They told him that it was necessary that he should come provided with a similar certificate from all the provincial States before they could entertain his proposal. Here was all his labour in Holland to be begun over again; but the persevering man, not a whit daunted, set about the task with good courage. He first went to the University of Franeker, then to the deputies of Friesland, assembled at Leeuwarden; then to those of Overyssel, at Zwolle, where he found great opposition; and lastly, to Amsterdam. While he was there, the Prince of Sweden happened to visit that city; Dury, of course, did not miss the

Digitized by Google

opportunity, and his highness promised to do what he could among his Lutheran subjects. Having thus concluded his Dutch tour, our hero thought that a fresh certificate from Cromwell might not be without its influence at the next meeting of the States General; he sailed from Flushing on the 14th and landed at Margate on the 15th of February, 1657. His own account of his adventures concludes with the following resolution of the House of Commons:—

June 26th, 1657.—'Ordered by the parliament that it be recommended to his highness the Lord Protector at the desire of the parliament, that his highness will be pleased to encourage all Christian endeavours for uniting the Protestant Church abroad; and that the lord deputy, the lord Lambert, Master Secretary, General Desberow, and Colonel Jones be desired to present this vote to the Lord Protector.'

We now lose Dury as a guide, and must follow his history from the necessarily inferior materials which the diligence of Benzelius was able to collect. It appears that he remained quiet till the Restoration in 1660; and that he then addressed a letter to Charles II., setting forth what he had already done, and what he still hoped to perform. The only wonder is, that our hero ever expected to receive an answer; however, nothing daunted when he found that his application was unnoticed, he applied to Archbishop Juxon, whose reply is preserved. It is exactly that which might be expected. Nothing could be more desirable than the union of all Christians; nothing more in accordance with the Archbishop's own particular wish; but the divisions in England must be taken into consideration. If foreign princes would unite in expressing any desire for the mediation of the Anglican Church, it would then be the time for her prelates to consult the king as to what his own feelings might be, &c. Finding that he was thus thrown on his own resources, Dury—who, it must be remembered, was now upwards of sixty—again went into Holland, and travelled through the whole of the country, visiting pastors, scattering papers, claiming to be heard at Synods, in short, leaving no stone unturned to effect his purpose. Imagining that he had made some little progress in this country, he was anxious to go again into Sweden, but was deterred, *as he says*, by the fate of the bishop Matthiæ, who had been by this time deprived for his book called the Olive Branches. He forgets to state that the sentence of banishment pronounced against him, under Christina, had never been repealed. However, as he was unable to go himself, he sent a number of pamphlets, which might tend to further his purpose; and, deriving fresh hopes from the Conference of Cassel—of which we shall presently have occasion to speak—he went, in 1662, into Switzerland, and having kept alive what-

Digitized by Google

ever interest might still be existing there, journeyed back again into Belgium. Before this time, he had obtained the co-operation of the then celebrated divine Dannhauer, of Strasborg, who, however, now felt it his duty to protest against the sacrifice of truth to peace. On this, in a published pamphlet, Dury cited his opponent to appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; and the almost immediate death of Dannhauer no doubt served to confirm him in his pre-conceived opinions. His chief stay, at this time, was a harmony of Protestant Confessions, published in the 'Syntagma Confessionum,' Geneva, 1654; which he dispersed into every corner of Western Europe. Finding it difficult to return to England, and yet perceiving it to be requisite that, at his advanced age, he should have some definite home, he accepted the invitation of Hedwig Sophia, Landgravine of Hesse, and about the year 1664 settled at Cassel, making his excursions from, and with a view of returning to, that place. Again we find him in Switzerland, whence he visited the Palatinate, and extended his tour to Berlin, where he was in 1667. During the next three years, his wanderings were more widely extended than ever they had been before; were we to trace him from state to state, and from principality to principality, a volume, instead of an article, would be requisite. But, in 1670, he made the discovery that his attempts, so far as the Lutherans were concerned, had been conducted on a wrong principle; that he should not have sought for the acquiescence of the whole body in his scheme, but should have endeavoured to interest, one by one, the separate Lutheran communities in its success. He therefore thought it necessary, so far as they were concerned, to begin all over again; and, in 1671, printed, at Cassel, his 'Axiomata Communia quæ procurandæ et conservandæ Paci inter Evangelicos judicata sunt necessaria.' This he sent into Sweden, and, in 1672, to Spener at Frankfort. In the latter year he published a 'Brevis Disquisitio de veris Fundamentalibus.' He here reduced all that a Christian need to believe to the bare articles of the Apostles' Creed; he summed up his obedience in the Decalogue, and his hope in the Lord's Prayer. He added that the Œcumenical Creeds ought to be embraced so far as they were clear; and that Louis Bayly's 'Practice of Piety,' and Arndt's 'Treatise on True Christianity,' ought to be embraced by all. After such a declaration, no Lutheran would answer him in any private communication; but Meisner replied to him publicly. His last extant letter is addressed to Count de la Gardie, Chancellor of Sweden, and is dated May 6, 1672; but he lived and wrote long after this. In 1674, he published—and the work shows no evidence of decayed faculties—a treatise in French, 'Touchant l'Intelligence de l'Apoca-

Digitized by Google

lypse, par l'Apocalypse même;' and here he first gave evidence that he had adopted the system of George Calixtus, and was willing to embrace Roman Catholics as well as Protestants and Reformed, in his pacification. In 1676, he printed 'Le véritable Chrétien;' and in the following year, a pamphlet in the same language, on Christian Union. In 1678, the Quaker Penn visited him at Cassel; after which we have no authentic accounts of his proceedings. It is said, however, that he survived the year 1690; but of the exact date or circumstances of his death no record exists. Whatever might have been his mistakes, however impossible in its very nature was the union which he proposed to effect, however entirely, in his desires for pacification, he offended against the unity of the true faith, it is impossible but to believe that a life of such unwearied labour, of such constant self-denial, of such indefatigable devotion to one, and that so holy an object, must at last have merited the blessing promised to the peacemakers. God grant that it may have been so!

Any one who has been travelling northward through the province of Sleswig, will not easily forget the beauty of the view, when after traversing the huge central common, and the beech-covered hills of that country, he first catches sight of the Flensborg Fjord, of the four spires of the busy bustling little town beyond it, of the deep forests in which it is embosomed, and the intense blue of the creek on which its fishing craft are riding at anchor. If, when you reach the place, instead of turning to the right down the high street, you keep to the left, eight or ten miles will bring you to the little village of Medelbye, or Meelbye, with its rough First-pointed church, and interior wall-arches. Here it was that in the year 1586 was born George Kallisön, better known by his Latinized name of Calixtus. His father John, the son of a tradesman at Aabenvae had been a pupil of Melanchthon's at Wittemberg, and of Chytræus; then a schoolmaster, and finally settled as pastor at Medelbye, an office which he held for fifty years. The ingenuity of the adversaries of Calixtus discovered ill omens in his very name. Thus Walch insisted that it should properly be written CALvinomIXTUS; and another divine found out a manifest identity between the name of the great Syncretist and the number of the Beast in the Apocalypse.[1]

His mother was the second wife of the Sleswig pastor, and some very pretty letters which she wrote in her native Platt Deutsch patois to her son when he was at school, are still extant;

[1] He made it out thus: take D, signifying the title of Doctor, and the name Calixtus, write them together, and count six of the letters,—and there, sure enough, is 666: D C a L I X t V s.

Digitized by Google

one in which, speaking of his absence, she prays 'that the dear God, who is Almighty, would bring him back again to her and his father;' another in which she sends him a pair of summer gloves, and promises to make the next better.[1] The pastor himself was, as his friends used to call him, a Latin man: he wrote in Latin, he talked in Latin, he thought in Latin; he used to write Latin epigrams to his wife and his children; their baptism and their birthdays were celebrated in Latin acrostics and chronostics. As we have said, he changed Kallisön into Calixtus, and Medelbye with him was always Medeloboa. At that time, the Concordien Formel, as we have before said, was not received in Sleswig: the pastors were under the charge of a Superintendent, and were sworn to the following six articles; 1, to believe and maintain Holy Scripture; and 2, the Three Creeds; and 3, the Confession of Augsburg, the Articles of Smalcald, and the greater and lesser Catechisms of the Holy Father and Doctor Martin Luther; 4, to embrace the Lutheran doctrine concerning the Sacrament of the Altar; 5, to oppose all teaching contrary to 2 and 3, but chiefly—6, all Anabaptists, Sacramentaries, Zuinglians, Carlostatians, Calvinists, and Bezaites. This, therefore, must have been the religious instruction of young Calixtus, both in the parsonage of Medelbye, and when, at the age of twelve, he was sent to school at Flensborg.

Helmstädt was the university selected for the young Danish student. It had been founded by Julius of Brunswick, in 1576, and was from him known officially as the Academia Julia. At that time it was the scene of a vigorous conflict between the old Lutheran party and the Humanists and Philippists, and it was to the latter faction that Calixtus joined himself. He spent six years in studies, the character and severity of which were amply shown afterwards, by his vast attainments. A journey in 1609 to Jena, Giessen, Mainz, and Tübingen, made him known to the principal Lutheran and Reformed divines; and a second tour, which occupied from 1611 to 1613, took him to Cologne, to Leyden, and to England. Here he contracted an intimacy with Isaac Casaubon, a man the most likely of all to influence a mind already disposed to ideas of a general pacification. His very

[1] 'Noch deutlicher aber sieht man aus dem Briefe das treue Mutterherz, welches keine grössere "Freude hat als von des Sohnes Gesundheit und seinem Wohlstande zu erfahren;" sie bittet das "der liebe Gott, der allmächtig ist, ihr und seinem Vater allezeit gute Zeitung von ihm verleihen möge; bis er aus dem fremden ri Lande weder zurckwandern werde; sie und sein Vater sind noch ziemlich zufüeden nach alter Leute Weise;" sie dankt für Geschenke, und schickt ihm wieder, ein Paar Sommerhandschuh; ein andermals will sie es besser machen, jetzt soll er vorlieb nehmen, und wenn er noch etwas brauche was sie ihm verschaffen könne, soll er es schreiben; sie empfiehlt ihn dem lieben Gott, dass er ihn gesund spare nach seinem göttlichen Willen.'—*Henke*, p. 82.

Digitized by Google

interesting Latin journal, lately published at Oxford, amply proves his desire for unity, not always according to knowledge, on the principles of the primitive Church. Thus, for example, he writes under the date of January 1st, 1611:—

'O great Ruler of the world, Thou hast given me a desire of directing my life according to Thy precepts; but when I inquire after Thy will, I am sometimes perplexed by the so widely differing tenets of men. It appears to me hard to account Thy ancient Church to have fallen into such perilous ignorance, that they who seek to be saved must now embrace an opposite belief. I see some defending, under the pretext of antiquity, the grossest errors; and others, while they avoid modern mistakes, who make everything new; together with abuses they condemn the use of many most holy institutions, and abrogate them by their own authority. I see that the authors of a necessary reformation agree among themselves so little, that one of them is held a wolf by the other. Christ Jesus, the very name of Thy primitive Church has the greatest weight with me; and I am persuaded that things approved by that, and in no wise contrary to Thy Holy Scripture, should not rashly be rejected or altered.'

On October 20th, 1611, he writes:—

'This day, I and my wife, with a part of our family, communicated in the Lord's Supper with the French Church. (He of course means the French Protestant congregation.) Thou knowest, Christ Jesus, what are my hesitations in this most sacred matter, and how much more I approve of the Anglican form. But I am led by a pious wish not entirely to abstain from communion with that Church. I see that I should thus be a stumbling-block to weaker brethren, from which may God preserve me. I seem to be able to say this with confidence; either the whole ancient Church thought wrongly of that benefit and mystery, or else those of our days grievously offend with respect to it. I beseech Thy Majesty, Eternal God, to heal the diseases of Thy Church, and to deliver those from scruples who seek to serve Thee with a pure mind.'

Again, October 31st, 1610:—

'I was invited to-day to be present at the service for the consecration of two Scottish bishops and one archbishop. I observed the rites, and the imposition of hands, and the prayers. O God, how great was my pleasure! Do Thou, Lord Jesus, preserve this Church, and give a better mind to our Puritans, who deride such things.'

Yet, on the 19th of June in the next year, he says:—

'I was present to-day at the consecration of two bishops,'—that is, Giles Thompson of Gloucester and John Buckeridge of Rochester,—'and observed the very beautiful ceremonies, though the pomp was, perhaps, excessive.'

It is no wonder that a man who could thus see faults on all sides, and was worn out with the unceasing theological disputes of his time, should at length write, Nov. 21st, 1611:—

'Lord Jesus, I am weary of living; my useless life is tedious. My former studies have been lost; those which I am now carrying on make me ashamed as a novice. On all sides is distress.'

After spending some time in London, Calixtus visited both Oxford and Cambridge; in the university libraries he spent a great part of his days. To the English court he had the easier

Digitized by Google

access, from the circumstance that Anne, queen of James I., was sister to Elizabeth, Duchess of Brunswick. It is related by one of his biographers, that our traveller used to affirm, in after years, 'My studies in ecclesiastical history owe more to English bishops and to English libraries, than to anything I ever learnt in Germany.' Returning by way of Paris, where he became acquainted with the celebrated De Thou, he was deterred from visiting Italy, by the fear that one or two writings which he had already published against Roman Catholics might endanger his safety in that country. He therefore returned to Helmstädt, intending to devote himself to an academical life.

The first occurrence which gave him an European reputation happened shortly after his return. A young nobleman of Hildesheim, Ludolf von Klencke by name, was about to join the Roman Church. His mother, much distressed by this change of religion, persuaded her son that it was his duty to examine for himself what could be said by a Lutheran divine in disputation with his Roman advisers. He consented; Calixtus was named as the champion on one side, the Jesuit Augustinus Turrianus on the other. The dispute was held in the castle of Hämelschenburg, on the Weser; and Calixtus laid down these three theses as grounds of discussion:—1. Whatever the Roman pontiff determines is infallibly true; this is the foundation and first principle of the Popish religion, and it is false. 2. Whatever Holy Scripture teaches is infallibly true; this is the first principle and foundation of the orthodox and catholic religion, and it is true. 3. In those things which are clearly laid down in Scripture, all matters necessary to salvation are contained. The acts of this dispute were never published in the lifetime of Calixtus, who had given his word that they should not appear; they were printed at Helmstädt, after his death. Certainly, in their present form, they give the Lutheran Doctor the undoubted advantage; but it may not be altogether unfair to remember the fable of the man and the lion. Else there is no doubt that the Jesuits put forward a very incompetent advocate. Take this as an example:—

'*Turrianus.* As if contraries could not be true at one and the same time.

'*Calixtus.* Sir, for God's sake, learn logic. Assertions absolutely contrary to each other may both be false at one and the same time, but never can, at one and the same time, both be true.

'*Turrianus.* You choose to pronounce this on your own authority.

'*Calixtus.* It is not I who say it, but right reason and all logicians without one exception; there is not a scholar who is ignorant of it.'

And the finale was as follows:—

'*Turrianus.* I see that you are exceedingly vehement, to such a point as to neglect yourself and your own health; you would do wisely if you would

Digitized by Google

get over that vehemence, and strain your voice less; I wished to try what you would say, if I brought forward what I did.

'*Calixtus.* You know that we have not met about a jocular, but about a very serious matter. Nor is there any reason why you should try me as you would a pupil, whether I understand logic or not. I shall not learn it from you, seeing that I have myself taught it for several years. And to say truth, I have not discovered any great acquaintance with that art in yourself. But, with respect to your having in a matter of such great moment so boldly and constantly denied that which you know to be true, nay, which very boys know to be true,—I say that you have sinned against your conscience, and have offended God by a grievous sin, which He will follow by a grievous punishment, unless you repent from your heart.'

It seems, however, that whether our disputant maintained the field by force of logic or not, he finally routed his opponent by a stratagem, more ingenious than straightforward. In the course of the dispute he insisted on referring to the Hebrew text, and grounding his arguments on that alone. The Jesuit at once confessed himself to be but imperfectly acquainted with that language; and as the Lutheran insisted on his proposition, the colloquy was manifestly at an end. However, though the main point was lost—for the young nobleman joined the Church of Rome—Calixtus's reputation was made. He was rewarded by the Duke with a professorship in the university, and in 1615 he was received into the theological faculty, inaugurating his career with a thesis,—*that kingdoms and states cannot safely coexist with the religion of Papists or Jesuits.*

From the period of his obtaining the dignity of Professor, the reputation of Calixtus extended itself more and more widely throughout Germany. He married, in 1619, Catherine Gertner, the only event which, for some years, diversified his theological studies. Year after year, and one might almost say, month after month, he continued to pour forth a series of works, which it is wonderful that any one man could have found the time even to copy out. Thus, besides published letters, congratulatory poems and the like, and in addition to a number of treatises edited by him, he published one hundred and seven works in Latin and nine in German, besides leaving twenty-seven more ready for the press. It was his hard fate to be at once the most zealous labourer for the universal peace of Christendom and the author who, in a most polemical age, was under the necessity of composing the largest number of polemical treatises. A common object of attack both to the Reformed and to Catholics, he was, perhaps, more bitterly hated by Lutherans than by either. Add to which, that he witnessed the greater part of the miseries of the thirty years' war; and that when, in 1625, the university was dispersed by that and by the pestilence, he alone of all the professors remained at his post; and it will be manifest that the end

Digitized by Google

and aim of all his wishes, peace, was never removed further from any man than from him.

It was early in his career that the outcry of Syncretism was raised against him by his Lutheran colleagues. A new faith, an unheard-of schism, a betrayal of truth, a contempt of the Lutheran communion, Philippism, Synergism, Crypto-Papism, Crypto-Calvinism, Mahometanism, Babelism, Samaritanism, Anti-Christianism, Libertinism, Neutralism, Indifferentism, Quodlibetic faith, and Atheism; — all these charges were brought against him, in innumerable specimens of those little, fat, square quartos, in which the presses of Frankfort, Jena, and Leipsic then abounded. Theses, syntagmata, apologies, programmes, articles, memorials, were all hurled against him; partly by Calvinists, but principally by the rigid Lutherans, of whom Statius Buscher and John Hülsemann may stand as types.

Nothing could be more wearisome than to trace the course of all these controversies. Even the German patience of Dr. Hencke shrinks from the task; and yet even in the first, and as yet only published volume of his biography, the enumeration is long enough to try the patience of most readers to its extreme limit. The two great principles on which the whole theology of our doctor was founded were these: 1st, That the essential principles of Christianity were preserved inviolate in the three denominations of Christians, and were all contained in the Apostles' Creed. 2d, That the tenets which had been received by the whole Catholic Church during the first five centuries were to be considered as of equal weight with the express declarations of Holy Scripture. Whole books were filled with compositions extracted from the writings of Calixtus, and which were held up as heretical; the indefatigable Moller has collected fifty-one of these. Some of them are exceedingly curious, and make the Syncretism of our author approach that which is so widely spreading among us now; as for instance, that the Roman Pontiff held the primacy of dignity with respect to the whole Church, and a certain primacy of power, though only *jure ecclesiastico*, in the Western Church; that the invocation of saints was to a certain extent both lawful and expedient; that prayers for the dead were by no means to be forbidden; that between the day of death and that of judgment there is a middle state, the nature of which he did not pretend to define; that the number of Sacraments was neither defined by Scripture nor by universal tradition; that baptized infants were justified by the faith of the Church; that a certain degree of merit might be attributed to good works. So much for his endeavours to approach the Catholics; he was not less desirous

Digitized by Google

of endeavouring to propitiate the Reformed. Thus he asserts that the Holy Eucharist may in a certain sense be named a mere commemoration of Christ's death; that S. Augustine's doctrine and that of Calvin were identical on the question of predestination; that God might be called improperly and *per accidens* the occasion of sin; (and, indeed, in the first edition of his 'Epitome Theologiæ,' he had worded the assertion still more offensively, writing *was* where he afterwards substituted *might be called*.) For these deflections both on one side and on the other from the Lutheran doctrine, the rigid Protestants fell upon him like a swarm of wasps. Abraham Calovius distinguished himself above the rest; Hülsemann, Dannhauer, and the Saxon divines were scarcely behind him. And it must never be forgotten that Lutheranism is the most intolerant of all religions that ever were invented: we have seen almost in our own times a Swedish preacher condemned to death and imprisoned for life, for having affirmed in the pulpit that good works might in a certain sense be called the cause of salvation. Nor, as was natural, did our doctor find a whit more favour in the eyes of Roman Catholics on account of his concessions. They perhaps were the more indignant because he openly espoused the cause, and borrowed some of the arguments, of Marc Antonio de Dominis, Archbishop of Spalato, whose varied career was sketched in a late number of the *Christian Remembrancer*. However that may be, Leo Allatius and Abraham Ecchelensis attacked him whenever they found an opportunity; his old pupil, Nihusius, whose reconciliation with Rome made a considerable stir, was one of his most venomous assailants. The Calvinists alone seem to have refrained from persecuting him, though he was certainly on fundamental points more widely at variance with them than with either of the other communions.

His 'Epitome Theologiæ,' in 1619, was received with general applause; war and plague prevented him for some years after from bringing out any great work. In 1628 he took in hand a 'Summa Theologiæ;' in 1629 he gave to the public a history of those heresies which concern the Incarnation (in which, by the way, he was himself accused of renewing the heresy of Elipandus). In 1631 he published a treatise on the marriage of clergy, in which, forgetting his usual moderation, he made no scruple about speaking of the 'Hildebrandine heresy;' and in 1634 he printed his 'Moral Theology.'

By this time the divines of Helmstädt were largely imbued with his own pacific spirit; and in consequence the mission of John Dury was warmly welcomed by himself and his colleagues. Passing over the labours of the next years, we come to

Digitized by Google

one of the most remarkable events in which Calixtus took a part, the Charitative Colloquy of Thorn.

It was about the same time at which Dury settled himself in England that another attempt at union had its origin in an entirely different quarter. There was one Bartholomew Nigranus, who had been pastor of the Reformed communion at Dantzic, and had afterwards joined the Roman Church; he thought that it might be possible, by means of a general conference, to bring the three religious bodies, Catholics, Lutherans, and Calvinists, into communion with each other. It would seem that his scheme did not extend to the Socinians, who, as is well known, abounded in Prussia and in Poland. It appears that Nigranus had formed his plan as early as 1636; but he had no means of interesting the King of Poland, then Ladislas IV., in his design till six years later. This monarch, himself a zealous Roman Catholic, nevertheless entertained the greatest hopes from the proposed conference. It could not meet as a council, nor a synod of any kind; it was a new thing, and therefore must have a new name; and the title chosen was that of a Charitative Colloquy.

In 1643 it happened that a provincial Synod of the Polish bishops met at Warsaw, under the presidency of Matthew Lubienski, Archbishop of Gnesen. The Primate embraced the opportunity of setting forth the practicability of the scheme originated by Nigranus; and a synodal letter was drawn up 'to those who dissent in points of faith from the Roman 'Catholic Church in the kingdom of Poland and the duchy of 'Lithuania, by which they are invited to a friendly congress 'and fraternal reconciliation at Thorn, in Prussia, on the 10th 'of October, 1644.' George Tyskievicz, Bishop of Samogitz, was to be president; and the base on which the colloquy was to be conducted, was to be Holy Scripture and the authority of the Primitive Church.

The Calvinists entertained no very great hopes of a real reconciliation. The Duke of Courland, however, and the Elector of Brandenburg, as vassals of the King of Poland, (the latter in respect of his duchy of Prussia,) assembled their divines at Orle; the result was a determination to be present at the conference if the king would defer its meeting till the next year. Ladislas, overjoyed that his Reformed subjects had so far consented to gratify him, altered the day to August 28th, 1645. In the meantime the Lutherans, the least important body of the three, had held their own assembly at Lesne, and were unanimous in determining to accept the invitation. At the appointed time the little town of Thorn was full to overflowing. The king appointed three presidents, George Tyskievicz as repre-

Digitized by Google

senting the Roman Catholics, Zbigneus de Goray Gorayski, Lord of Chelm, for the Reformed, and Sigismund Guildenstern, Lord of Stume, for the Lutherans. Ladislas was himself represented by George de Tenczin, Chancellor of the kingdom. On the Roman side there were five-and-twenty theologians, some from each bishopric; their chief was George Schönhoff. The Reformed sent fifteen, of whom John Berg was nominal head; but to the surprise of every one, the chief management of their affairs was left to the Lutheran George Calixtus, incomparably the ablest man in the assembly. The Lutherans also sent fifteen divines, of whom John Hülsemann was the most celebrated. Other theologians afterwards joined the conference.

Before the proceedings commenced, a violent quarrel broke out between the Lutherans and the Reformed, the former insisting that Calixtus ought not to be present among the latter. Calixtus himself protested that he only agreed with his Calvinist associates in their opposition to Rome, and that his sole purpose in joining them was his earnest desire to promote Christian unity. Matters being thus accommodated, each party prepared for the first session.

At eight o'clock on the morning of August 28th, the Roman theologians attended a Mass of the Holy Ghost, celebrated pontifically by George Tyskievicz in the church of S. John Baptist. This finished, they repaired to the Town-hall, where they were the first to arrive. The Chancellor took his place in the middle of the upper end; on his right hand sat Tyskievicz, and by him in order the Catholic divines. The Reformed had met at the Gymnasium, whence, as soon as they heard that their opponents had already taken their places, they repaired to the scene of action under Goray Gorayski, and occupied the left hand of the President. The Lutherans were unfortunate in being compelled to forego the assistance of Guildenstern, laid up by a violent attack of gout. They came last, and contented themselves with the lowest place. George Calixtus, together with the divines of Elbing—one here sees the effects of John Dury's labours in that place—and those of Thorn, took up a separate position.

The Chancellor commenced by a speech, in which he set forth the piety of Ladislas, the advantages of Christian unity, the happy results which might be expected if the present proceedings could be continued as they had been begun, in a brotherly spirit, and the necessity of instituting some strict rules respecting the order and method of the conference. He next exhibited the letters patent, in virtue of which he assumed the office of President, and then read the royal injunctions which laid down the method to be pursued throughout the

Digitized by Google

proceedings. The regulations imposed by Ladislas evinced his prudence. The whole colloquy was to consist of three actions, to be treated in an indefinite number of sessions. In the first, the true sentiments of each party were to be handed in in writing, expressed as briefly and tersely as possible; no proofs to be adduced, except testimonies that these were the genuine tenets of the communion which brought them forward. Thus, at one glance, the agreement and variation of the three bodies would be most clearly seen. In the second action, the different opinions were to be discussed, while the controversy was conducted in the most friendly and brotherly manner that could be devised. And the third action was to be occupied by an endeavour to decide what each of these communions would be willing to surrender for the sake of peace. Each party was to appoint two deputies, who in the private sessions were alone to speak, and in the public meetings to lead and to moderate among their own followers. Each confession was to appoint two notaries; but nothing was to be published under the title of Proceedings except that which should have been approved by the presidents and the deputies. Matters having proceeded thus far, the Lutherans and the Calvinists, each yielding to the Roman Catholics the first post of honour, disputed between themselves the second; after a long discussion it was conceded to the latter.

The first session was held on the following day. The Catholics handed in a paper of conditions, the principal article among which was that, when they should once have defined their own doctrine, it should not be allowable to their adversaries to impute anything to them which they had thus implicitly denied. The conditions exhibited by the Calvinists were somewhat longer; they insisted that Holy Scripture should be quoted in the originals; that its plain and natural signification was to be received as the only rule of faith; that, nevertheless, the testimony of the first three centuries might be adduced, not as infallible, but, considering the respect in which it ought to be held, for as much as it was worth. The Lutherans were not yet prepared with their terms, and it was therefore determined that the proceedings should begin. The place of meeting was the Town-hall of Thorn; and there, on that day, probably for the only time since the Reformation, the three contending parties united in a religious act. Bishop Tyskievicz intoned the 'Veni Creator Spiritus;' the theologians of the three confessions took it up; and, on the conclusion of the hymn, they took their oaths of compliance with the king's edict,—the Catholics to the bishop; the Protestants and the Reformed to the king's legate. Thus ended the first day's business.

Digitized by Google

On the 1st of September the Calvinists requested to give in a reply to the strictures which had in the meantime been sent to them by the Catholic divines. They affirmed that while Scripture was their only rule of faith, they nevertheless acquiesced in the Creeds of the Apostles, of Nicæa, of Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon; and, so far as they were concerned with the heresies of their day, they received the professions of faith authorized by the fifth and sixth Œcumenical Councils. With respect to the controversies that had arisen of late years, they consented to the Confession of Augsburg, and to the formula of Sendomir; if any more particular declaration were needed, they were ready to furnish it. In the fifth session, September 4th, a difficulty arose with respect to the title Catholics. The Roman theologians insisted that it should be applied absolutely, and without any adjunct, to them; their opponents protested that they should content themselves with the name of Roman Catholics. It was finally agreed that the notaries of each party should be at liberty to use the appellation which they preferred.

On the following day, a more serious obstacle presented itself. It had been agreed that each session should commence with prayer. The Reformed were willing to concede to the Catholics that these prayers should be offered by the Bishop of Samogitz. The Lutherans, however, stood out obstinately; each of the three parties, they said, ought to have equal privileges, and the divines of each should therefore take their turn in the preliminary prayers. In the eighth session, the question was settled by permission being given to the Lutherans to hold their assemblies apart, while the two other communions were praying in common. All these proceedings bear a very curious resemblance to the controversy that arose some twenty years ago, with respect to the desirableness of opening the meetings of the Bible Society with prayer.

This matter being settled, the Lutherans bound themselves to stand by the articles of the unvaried Confession of Augsburg; in which, as they affirmed, all the fundamental articles of faith, set forth in Scripture, were contained. Hülsemann, whose delight seems to have consisted in seizing every possible occasion for introducing matters of discord, made a furious attack on the Reformed for professing their assent to this Confession. In the next session, the Catholics exhibited, as their faith, the belief of the Catholic Church, expressed in Councils, whether general or particular, in so far as they were legitimately approved; and more especially that of Trent. The Lutherans replied that the faith defined by the really general Councils, and by two Synods which they especially valued, namely, those of Milevi and the

Digitized by Google

second of Orange, were the same that were contained in the Confession of Augsburg and the Articles of Smalcald. Therefore, in the eleventh session, the Catholics expressed more minutely their faith on the points controverted between them and their opponents. This document was admirably drawn out, and is worth abstracting. It commences by disclaiming certain opinions falsely attributed to the Catholic Church by her enemies. It then asserts, that the rule of faith is the whole Word of God, whether written or unwritten. That the fall of Adam had not only brought punishment and death on his posterity, but also, and that truly and properly, sin; which sin had, however, not destroyed free will, though it would have deprived it of all strength for good works, unless God the Father had sent the Son as the full and only propitiation of mankind. That Christ died for the sins of the whole world, although they only were justified to whom His merit was communicated. That we are justified freely, and not by our own works; and although adults were bound to dispose themselves for the reception of justification, yet that disposition does not merit it. That by justification we are, and are not merely accounted, righteous. That, therefore, all are bound to the observance of the laws of God as not being impossible; that the labours of the righteous will receive an infinite reward; and that, if a man endeavours to serve God with the view of obtaining their reward, he sins neither mortally nor venially. That no man could be absolutely assured of his own faith or salvation. That a baptized man, after falling into sin, must be reconciled to God by the Sacrament of Penance, and by the merits of Christ. With respect to the Sacraments, that while the general analogy of the whole of Scripture is allowed, those of the Evangelical differ from those of the Mosaic law. That Baptism is universally necessary to salvation; preceded, in the case of adults, by their own faith; in the case of infants, by that of the Church. That in the Lord's Supper, Christ is really and truly present and eaten, even by the unworthy partaker; that the manner in which He is present has been well defined by the word Transubstantiation; that, therefore, the essence of the sacrament did not consist in its mere use; that the reception in both kinds was not an absolute command of Christ. The rest of the declaration consists of an enumeration of the other five sacraments; an assertion of the honour due to saints; and a defence of the general rites and ceremonies of the Church. The Reformed next exhibited their own declaration; but on perusal, it was found to be so verbose, so full of superfluous dogmas, and so injuriously expressed as regarded the other two confessions, that it was returned by the presidents, with

Digitized by Google

the request that it might be again presented in an amended form.

In the fourteenth session, the Acts of the whole Colloquy were to be read over. But Hülsemann, ever ingenious in discovering difficulties, insisted either that the title of Very Reverend Lords should not be attributed to the Catholic prelates, or that a similar appellation should be bestowed on the Lutheran divines. The Reformed then brought in their amended declaration of doctrine. When it had been read, Tyskievicz protested against its insertion in the Acts, as offensive and unnecessary. The Royal Legate took the same view. It was contrary, he said, to the king's intention, that such expressions as the Calvinists had employed should be permitted: they were at perfect liberty to say,—*This I believe,—This I do not believe,*—but not to add, *This I condemn and abominate.* The Lord of Chelm, with that desire of meeting others half-way which distinguished the Reformed throughout the whole Colloquy, protested that there had been no intention of giving offence, and that, if fairly taken, the expressions complained of were not objectionable; nevertheless, for the sake of peace, everything should be withdrawn which afforded the Catholics ground of complaint. Tyskievicz replied, that the offensive portions were these:—the phrases *abominate, detest,* and *condemn,* applied by the Reformed to the Roman doctrine; the imputation to the Catholics of dogmas which they not only did not hold, but had formerly anathematized; the assertion that their saints and relics were spurious; that they spoke of the Roman Church as false, tyrannical, and antichristian. Besides this, their explanation of their own doctrine, especially on the question of the Holy Eucharist, was so obscure as to be unintelligible; and, in contravention of the royal edict, they had adjoined proofs to their assertions. The confession of faith was therefore, for the second time, returned to be amended.

In the fifteenth session, which was held three days later, a warm dispute broke out between the Catholics and the Lutherans. The latter insisted that their opponents should specify at once, and definitely, what Councils they held to be legitimate, and legitimately approved. The Roman divines, on the contrary, urged the Lutherans to define the exact authority which they were willing to attribute to the decisions of Councils, and to state whether they would insist on any points of their then received Creed, which were not expressly laid down in the Confession of Augsburg.

At the end of the seventeenth session, the Chancellor was recalled to Warsaw on important business; and his absence at once showed the skill and moderation with which he had con-

Digitized by Google

ducted the proceedings. It is the united testimony of the writers of all three parties, that up to this period the colloquy had proceeded successfully, though its progress was slow. The new legate, John Leczynsky, Lord of Gnesen, opened the next session by expressing his belief that greater progress would be made were the royal injunctions more carefully followed. On this the Jesuit, George Schönhoff, made a long harangue, in which he set forth how, in his opinion, the instructions ought to have been obeyed; and the almost necessary consequence was, that the session was concluded by a violent quarrel between him, the Lord of Chelm, and Hülsemann. At the next meeting, the theologian John Berg began to reply to the speech of Schönhoff. He had scarcely commenced when he was interrupted by the President of the Lutherans, Bojanoffsky, who demanded how the letters of the Elector of Brandenburg were to be understood, affirming, as they did, that his theologians, Berg, Calixtus, and Reichel, were attached to the Augustine Confession, when Berg himself was acting with, and speaking for, the Reformed. The theologian replied, that the Elector would never allow himself to be excluded from the Confession of Augsburg, while, nevertheless, he adhered with all his heart to the Reformed communion. The Legate ruled that this controversy should proceed no further, on which Bojanoffsky protested against all future proceedings. Berg, continuing his harangue, happened to give his colleagues the title of Reverend Lords and Brethren. This brought up Tyskievicz, who said that such an appellation was an insult to the Roman prelates. 'Only let me speak,' replied Berg, 'and I will give no one any titles at all.' He was proceeding with his refutation of Schönhoff, when the Legate interrupted him and said, that, after all, this was not the way to arrive at any conclusion; and the session ended by a speech from Hülsemann, in which he threw all the blame of the delays on the Roman Catholics. This is a fair specimen of the manner in which the succeeding sessions were conducted. Each of the three parties wished to be heard in reply to their opponents; while none of the three would allow their own confessions to be commented on and refuted.

To improve the confusion, a dispute broke out in the twenty-fifth session, among the Lutherans themselves; the theologians from Königsberg separating themselves from their brethren. It must be confessed that throughout the whole colloquy the Reformed were the least, and the Lutherans the most guilty of offences against charity. At length it became absolutely certain, towards the beginning of November, that nothing effectual would be performed, and the thirty-sixth and last colloquy was held on the 21st of that month. The final harangue was

Digitized by Google

delivered by Tyskievicz, and it is remarkable that, in dismissing the theologians of the three confessions, he should have concluded with the words, '*Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature.*'[1]

Calixtus had stirred up a host of enemies against himself by appearing amongst the Reformed doctors at Thorn. The spirit with which the two parties regarded each other may be learnt from the expressions employed by Hülsemann, and accepted by all the rigid Lutherans, as to the conduct of our pacificator. He quotes, for example, that passage from the Corinthians, '*The things which the Gentiles sacrifice they sacrifice to devils, and not to God; and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils.*' He shows, from the Roman law, that any one who of his own accord entered the precincts of the enemy's camp, was himself reputed as an enemy; he quotes the thirty-third Canon of Nicæa, which forbids Catholics to worship with heretics, or schismatics; he reminds Calixtus that, according to S. Ignatius, heretics were to be regarded as wild beasts in human shape, from whom every Christian is bound to fly; and applies to the Calvinists the expressions of S. Leo; avoid 'the viperine Colloquies of heretics; let us have nothing in common with men who, opposing the Catholic faith, have nothing but the name of Christians.'

It was not to be expected that our doctor would sit still under these reproaches. The more bitterly he was attacked by such writers as Scharf, Calovius, Hülsemann, and Wella, the more boldly did he and his colleague, Conrad Harneius, express their own sentiments, and the more support did both find in the University of Helmstädt. Calixtus survived the Colloquy eleven years; and if the preceding part of his life had been one prolonged polemical dispute, its concluding portion was so overwhelmed by statements, replies, confutations, rejoinders, replications, and the like, that the mere catalogue of the more remarkable among these productions occupies thirty or forty pages of the great folio of Jäger.

The same year which had witnessed the Colloquy of Thorn,

[1] The best account of the Charitative Colloquy of Thorn is to be found in the 'Historia Ecclesiastica' of John Wolfgang Jaeger, vol. i. pp. 689—703. There is a briefer history given by Sagittarius, 'Introductio in Historiam Ecclesiasticam,' vol. ii. p. 1592. The Roman Catholics published their account of it at Warsaw, in 1646; the Reformed, at Berlin in the same year; the Lutherans, Hülsemann being editor, at Leipsic, in 1646. A reply was made to the latter by Constantine Prawdeck, of the Reformed party, with the title '*Entdeckung der Unwahrheiten D. Hülsemanni von dem Colloquio Charitativo.*' Hartknoch, in his History of the Prussian Church, enters at great length into the proceedings; but Abraham Calovius, in his History of Syncretism, devotes no less than 360 pages to the Acts of the Colloquy. Certainly theologians must have been great readers in those days.

Digitized by Google

witnessed the departure of one who had also laboured long and ardently for the union of Christians. This was Hugo Grotius; who, in every work that he published during the latter years of his life, was drawing more and more closely to a true idea of Catholic union. 'Those,' wrote he, 'who desire 'that the schism should be perpetual, who tremble when they 'hear of the unity and concord of the Church, these men have 'an interest in maintaining that the Pope is Antichrist, and 'that he will be so till the coming of the Lord. Were there 'no schism, many would have no means of living; and as, unless 'it were in hope of an income, they themselves would never 'dream of studying theology, they gauge all others by their 'own measure.'.... 'If,' he says in another place, 'in what I 'wrote in my youth, when I had less learning than now, I passed 'the bounds of truth, whether through the prejudices of my 'education or from receiving without inquiry what celebrated 'men had advanced without proof; is that any reason why now, 'after long years of research, and after having renounced all 'party spirit, I may not follow my truer convictions?' And still more remarkably in one of his latest works—'The Roman 'Church is not only Catholic, but furthermore is the President 'of the Catholic Church..... All that the Western Church, 'united to Rome, receives in common, I find to have been 'unanimously taught by the Greek and Latin Fathers, whose 'communion few will deny that we ought to embrace. It 'follows, therefore, that the principal means for re-establishing 'unity in the Church is to suffer no innovation in the doctrine, 'discipline, and manners which she has already received.'

Calixtus never went so far as this: but his later writings also evince warmer sympathy with the Roman Church than he had before expressed. Those who read and admired his works took the step on which he never ventured. Thus, John Frederick, Prince of Brunswick, in 1651 joined the Roman communion; but even all the liberality of the University of Helmstädt could not (and the question was submitted to its decision) allow him a private chapel in the family palace at Celle. So also the Landgrave Ernest of Hesse Rheinfels (grandson of that Landgrave to whom Luther allowed two wives at a time, and about whom he wrote to Melanchthon, to 'sin on with a good courage,' a sentence which has so deeply excited the admiration of Archdeacon Hare) became a Catholic in 1651; as the Landgrave of Hesse Darmstadt had done in 1636. In 1654 Europe was astonished to see the Queen of Sweden, the daughter of Gustavus Adolphus, after vainly endeavouring to procure a dispensation enabling her to receive the Lutheran Eucharist

Digitized by Google

once a year as a civil rite, resign her crown and embrace the Communion of Rome at Innsprück.

These conversions, it must be confessed, deeply offended the Syncretists; and Calixtus himself, to the conclusion of his life, never ceased to speak of those who had gone over to Rome as Apostates. He continued to labour with unceasing industry to the very end of a life which had scarcely known a day's illness; though after the death of his wife in 1654 his strength and spirits began to fail. At the end of January 1656, he received the Communion for the last time, and on his return home betook himself to the bed from which he knew that he should not rise again. He affords an instance of the ruling passion strong in death; he gave orders for the construction of a kind of desk, on which he should not only be able to write in a reclining posture, but should have his books about him as he had been accustomed. The evening before his death, while his colleagues were paying him a visit, after quoting the verse,—'I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith,'—he added, that he forgave from his heart all his opponents and calumniators, besought God to forgive them, and asked pardon for himself, if in any of his writings he had violated the law of Christian charity. Some one among the theologians speaking of the Passion of Christ,—'I,' said he, 'de-'sire to die under Christ the Head, and in the faith of the true 'Catholic Church, and in the love of all who sincerely love God. 'I condemn no one who is mistaken on non-necessary questions, 'and I trust to receive pardon from God if in any such, as may 'have been the case, I have myself erred. I acknowledge no 'other Author and Head of my salvation but God, the Father, 'the Son, and the Holy Ghost, in whose name I was baptized.' The next morning, which was the 19th March, 1656, the principal professors and doctors of the University were standing round the bed of the dying theologian, and, imagining that he was dozing, began to speak of the zeal of the Elector Palatine to promote a reconciliation between the Reformed and the Lutherans. Calixtus roused himself, and said in German—for he usually spoke to them in Latin—'I am very weary and tired 'of my life, and desire to depart and to be with Christ my 'Saviour and my Redeemer. Nevertheless, if I could con-'tribute anything to the carrying out his Electoral Highness's 'intention, I should still wish to live.' Professor Cellarius observed, not very opportunely, 'that the Calvinists claimed 'Calixtus as one of themselves.' 'If they do,' he replied, 'they 'will have to answer for it at the terrible judgment seat of God, 'in that last great day of the world when the secrets of all

Digitized by Google

'hearts shall be manifested.' They were the last words which he spoke.

As soon as their great adversary was removed, the rigid Lutherans began to insult his memory with the most opprobrious terms they could devise. In this attack upon the dead lion, Abraham Calovius distinguished himself, as he did in all the attempts to prevent union during half a century. Undeterred however by the outcry against Syncretism, the Landgrave of Hesse determined on another pacific conference to be held at Cassel, between Lutherans and Reformed only. On the side of the former, Peter Musæus, who had imbibed the sentiments of Calixtus, and John Heinrich, of Rintelen, were managers; on that of the latter, two Professors of Marburg, Curtius and Heinse. The Lutherans here evinced far more moderation than they had done at Thorn; and though no satisfactory result was attained, the disputants parted on good terms. In the first article, which respected the Lord's Supper, it is curious to observe how both parties endeavoured after an agreement to differ. They acquiesced in the assertion that the spiritual eating of our Lord's Flesh and Blood, which is the act of true faith, is necessary to salvation, and that without it the participation of that Sacrament can be of no avail; that the usual fraction of the Host was a useful and pious rite; that its shape was an indifferent matter. The point of difference was, that theologians of Rintelen affirmed, and those of Marburg denied, that the wicked as well as the good were really and truly partakers of our Lord's Body: they had, however, the complaisance to assure each other that this was an immaterial point. The other articles on which they could not agree, predestination, universal grace, the Passion of Christ suffered for all, final perseverance, and the like, were, according to their agreement, to be banished from the pulpit, and only to be treated in the schools with the greatest moderation and gentleness.

When the results of the conference became known, there was a general outcry throughout Lutheran Germany, against the doctors of Rintelen. They were accused of the grossest duplicity, of Syncretism in a degree as yet unknown, of being more Calixtine than Calixtus himself, of betraying the Lutheran faith for a mess of Calvinist pottage, and so forth. Musæus, in particular, was the especial object of attack; Hülsemann, indeed, could no longer assail him, as he had departed this life in the early part of the same year; but Strauch, Waller, and Calovius, as indefatigable for discord as ever Calixtus had been for peace, kept up the controversy. The University of Helmstädt remained true to its pacific principles; that of Jena

Digitized by Google

seconded it; nor was there wanting a like spirit among some of the divines at Königsberg. The Electors of Brandenburg, Frederic William, and Frederic, did what they could to allay the bitterness; but the controversy raged without diminution till the death of Calovius, in 1686, and the new disputes about the Pietists gradually extinguished it.

It is no part of our design to enter into the forced union between Protestants and Reformed, which has given rise to the so-called Evangelical Church of Prussia; nor to the cruel persecution which the rigid Lutherans suffered for refusing to enter into what they considered an unholy alliance. The history, however, would not be uninstructive, and would amply prove that, under the present House of Brandenburg, and in 'educated and enlightened Prussia,' Protestantism is just as intolerant, and would now be, if it dared, and may perhaps some day become, as sanguinary as ever.

It may seem strange that, in these attempts after a general union, the Eastern Church was left out of consideration; and this more particularly at Thorn, when some of the subjects and so many of the neighbours of the prince by whom that colloquy was appointed belonged to the Eastern faith. But it must be remembered that, in the latter half of the sixteenth century, the Lutherans and Calvinists had each made a desperate effort to obtain some recognition of their claims by Constantinople; and that the letter of Jeremiah, then Œcumenical Patriarch, had put a barrier in their way which no ingenuity could overleap. Further; only seven years before the Conference of Thorn, Cyril Lucar had been put to death for his Calvinistic leanings; while, in 1638, the Councils of Constantinople and Jassy had condemned his memory, and anathematised his teaching. The orthodox confession of Peter Mogila had not only been received throughout Russia, but had made a considerable sensation through all Europe.

It is certain, however, that the Lutherans did, notwithstanding all these repulses, look with longing eyes towards the East. A favourite subject of their academical theses was the supposed agreement of the Orientals with themselves, and discrepancy with Rome. A large collection of such pamphlets is now lying before us. Here, for example, is a '*Dissertatio inauguralis de Liturgiis Orientalibus in Doctrina de Sancta Eucharistia antiquæ veritati evangelicæ contra novos Pontificiorum et Reformatorum errores suffragantibus: publice defensa a Johanne Andrea Gleichio.*' Here again: '*Sacrificium Missæ Pontificium Liturgiis Orientalibus ignotum esse publice demonstrat Gottlieb Ernestus Marti;*' and here once more an '*Exercitatio Historico-Theologica de Ecclesia*

Digitized by Google

Grecanica hodierna, Allatio opposita ab Elia Veielio.' But whatever such attempts meant, or whether they meant anything at all, they were manifestly useless after the Council of Bethlehem had, in 1673, anathematised the doctrines of Lutheranism and Calvinism.

From this brief account of the attempts, in the seventeenth century, to bring about a reconciliation between the various communities of professing Christians, two things may, perhaps, chiefly be learnt. The one is that, at the commencement of the Reformation, and for many years after, the most bigoted Protestant felt, equally with the staunchest Roman Catholic, that such a state of schism could not continue without sin. The three parties had each of course its own view as to the means by which a pacification was to be effected. But among none of them did there prevail the view now generally adopted by Protestant theologians, that such a state of things is not unpleasing to God, and may be beneficial to Christianity. This appears very strikingly if one contrasts the efforts of Dury, or Calixtus, or Grotius, or, in earlier times, Cassander, with those of such a body as the Evangelical Alliance in our own days. The latter actually seems to regard division in non-essentials as a component part of the general scheme of Christianity; which non-essentials embrace about nine-tenths of the dogmas which all sects, from the time of the Reformation downwards, have considered it necessary to believe or to reject.

But the more important consideration is this;—the utter impossibility of carrying out, and the utter folly of forming, any plan of reconciliation which begins with unity, and ends with truth; which, again to refer to Bishop Andrewes's words, sets *Pax in terris* before *Gloria in excelsis.* Whether such attempts were made, as at first, by endeavouring to hit on a form of words which might mean two opposite things,—in fact, to approach Almighty God with a string of devotional puns,—or whether they were to be promoted by persuading all sects that, except what they already held in common, nothing at all was worth holding in common, both miserably and egregiously failed. Every one can now see how vain was the attempt of the early pacificators to unite those who disputed about the Holy Eucharist, by persuading them to receive our Lord's words, each in their own meaning. 'You,' they said to the Roman Catholics, 'may take *This is My Body,* in its natural 'signification. You,' to the Lutheran, 'may explain it to mean, 'My Body is present with this Bread, by way of consub-'stantiation. You,' to the Zuinglian, 'may interpret it, This 'is not My Body in any sense whatever. You,' to the Carol-

Digitized by Google

stadtian, 'may teach that our Lord, raising the bread in His 'hands, said, *Take, eat;* and then, pointing to Himself, added, '*This is My Body.* Interpret the words, all of you, in your 'own ways; only join in receiving them as words; and in this 'manner we shall obtain the union which we all desire.'

And yet, this is the kind of pacification which men now-a-days seem anxious to bring about. That it failed under the Tenisons, and Burnets, and Patricks of 1689, is, we trust, a sufficient omen of its fortunes in our own day, when it is recommended by their successors, equal in station but inferior in every other character.

Digitized by Google

ART. II.—1. *Of the Plurality of Worlds: An Essay.* London: J. W. Parker.

2. *More Worlds than One.* By SIR DAVID BREWSTER. London: John Murray.

3. *A Week's Conversation on the Plurality of Worlds.* By M. FONTENELLE. London: Printed for E Curll, in the Strand. 1728. [2d Edit.]

4. *Conjectures concerning the Worlds in the Planets.* Written in Latin by Christianus Huygens. London: Printed for Timothy Childe, at the White Hart. 1698.

5. *A Discovery of a New World, or a Discourse that 'tis probable there may be another Habitable World in the Moon.* By JOHN WILKINS, Bishop of Chester. London: Printed for John Gillibrand, at the Golden Ball. 1684. [4th Edit.]

'THIS is Ulysses! and indeed, also, it is surprisingly like him!' So, if we remember right, is the hero of the epic recognised. With scarce less certainty, and not less of amused and pleasant marvel, do we penetrate the thin disguise (it has a wonderfully Coan texture, even if it conceal no graceful form) under which the author of the 'Plurality of Worlds' affects to veil himself. There is something inexpressibly strange in the idiosyncrasies which unmistakeably mark an author. Perhaps it ought not to seem marvellous that a man should preserve his personal identity; but it is curious to observe how, with some men (and particularly with great men,) character—a χαρακτήρ—is stamped on all they do, or say, or think, or write. So is it pre-eminently with our essayist. Whether he writes 'Of Induction,' or 'Of the Plurality of Worlds,' he is ever *non* impar sibi—'as like as my fingers is to my fingers;' though, with Protean versatility of genius, and inexhaustible resources of information, *nihil ferè est quod non tetigit.* Would that we could add, *nihil quod tetigit, non ornavit!* Ever solid, he is not less seldom cumbrous. Ever weighty, he is rarely original or profound. When he condescends to the playful, we are more reminded of that grotesque fancy of the imagination, an elephant in love, or of the clumsy evolutions of a bear dancing in accompaniment to 'Pop goes the weasel,' than of that 'singularly sweet and facile pleasantry' which we have admired in a string of writers, from Theophrastus down to Dickens.

Really the disguise assumed by the anonymous writer of this

Digitized by Google

essay, to which we have alluded, is either an absurd affectation, or is ridiculously clumsy. If it was designed to be sincere, the essayist should, for once, have foregone such unique spelling as meets us in the fifth line of the preface. 'Offense'[1] is certainly most offensive. But we believe the authorship of the work in question was never any secret; and then we must say that the *fuga ad salices* of *such* a writer is ludicrous in the extreme.

So much for the style of this essay, and the guise under which it has been made to see the light. Let us introduce our readers to its subject-matter.

It is startling, and not altogether displeasing, to notice that our time and age is not wholly given over to positive science. Despite the contemptuous phraseology of the Auguste Comtes and the Martineaux of the day, people will talk, ay, and think too, about something less certain than tabulated phænomena. 'All things are double, one against another;' and perhaps the folly of electro-biologists, homœopathists, table-turners, and those who see in Dr. Cumming and Free-trade the end of evil, is the legitimate balance of the wiseacrehood of those who deem the human mind a mere machine for the operation of induction on registered results; and who suppose human interests to begin, and to terminate, in the province of sociology: 'Wisdom of fools, and folly of the wise!' Well, we were remarking that there are symptoms around us, that even the enlightenment of the nineteenth century cannot get on without some speculation. It seems that even those who have most strenuously insisted on the employment of a tardy and patient induction from ascertained facts, cannot wholly avoid the natural tendency in man to overleap his ignorance, and to 'theorize,'—to 'meteōrize,' we might say—touching matters at present, and probably for ever, beyond his ken. Several brochures have made their appearance in the past few years, which have astronomy (or astrology, as it might be more appropriately termed) for their subject-matter, and speculation for their method. Two works of more pretentious aspect have recently made their appearance, and it would seem have found a ready hearing. They profess to treat of a very grand and interesting subject; the question, namely, whether there be other populated globes besides our own in the universe. Considering the very confined compass within which all argumentation on such a thesis must necessarily be comprised, and the absence of nearly all data whereon to reason, we are bound to say, that these works are, in size and appearance, no way unworthy of the subject they profess to handle. Of tolerable bulk—and just tolerable price—they would seem to have

[1] This is altered in the later editions.

Digitized by Google

exhausted all that modern science, and one at least all that modern nescience, has to say on the subject. There is at once a curious similarity, and a curious contrast, observable between the two. Some of our readers will remember how remarkable a symmetry pervades that funny little drama, 'Box and Cox.' If Mr. B. observes, 'Sir, don't be absurd!' Mr. C. replies,—'Don't be ridiculous, Sir!' If Cox says, 'Goodness gracious!' Box recriminates with 'Gracious goodness!' So the volumes before us bear, on the face of them, a very obvious connexion and relationship. Slightly differing in external size, they are clad in the same garb of cœrulean azure—like the starry vault of which they treat—and gold. Their number of pages is almost precisely identical. *Facies non omnibus una, Nec diversa tamen, qualis decet esse sororum.* Yet their relationship is scarcely sororal. Compare their title-pages, and you will be inclined to adopt the metaphor so happily applied by Wordsworth to the clock of Trinity College Cambridge, 'that doubly strikes in male and female voice.'[1] The one is, 'Of the Plurality of Worlds: an Essay.' The other, in more gentle and less terse formula, proclaims: 'More Worlds than one, the creed of the Philosopher, 'and the hope of the Christian.' The one, in masculine phraseology, condescends to garnish his page with blank verse:

> 'On Nature's Alps I stand,
> And see a thousand firmaments beneath!—
> A thousand systems, as a thousand grains!
> So much a stranger, and so late arrived,
> How shall man's curious spirit not inquire
> What are the natives of this world sublime,
> Of this so distant, unterrestrial sphere,
> Where mortal, untranslated, never stray'd?'
>
> NIGHT THOUGHTS.

But *she* (we beg pardon—the *other*) pleads in softer strain and milder accents:

> 'Bright star of eve, that send'st thy softening ray
> Through the dim twilight of this nether sky,
> I hail thy beam like rising of the day,
> Hast thou a home for me when I shall die?
>
> 'Is there a spot within thy radiant sphere,
> Where love, and faith, and truth, again may dwell?
> Where I may seek the rest I find not here,
> And clasp the cherish'd forms I loved so well?'

Really one is involuntarily reminded of the flirtation between Adam and Eve in the Creation of Haydn!

The very title-pages indicate at once a genuine identity, and an individual and specific difference. We might be allowed to push the analogy of sex yet further. Not only in relative size,

[1] The Prelude.

Digitized by Google

but in disparity of age, 'The *Creed* and the *Hope*,'[1] &c., assumes her relative position, being in fact a few months junior in age, and many years in thought and wisdom to 'The Essay.' We may be thought unpardonably severe—not on the *books*—if we say, that the analogy does not fail when you pass beyond these sweet opening passages of apparent unity to the diametric variance which pervades the works themselves. Would that we could refrain from adding, that, if the author of 'The Creed 'and the Hope,' &c. had preserved the same anonymous disguise which the writer of the 'Essay' affects, we should have been led into the serious blunder of attributing his volume—not only by way of analogy, but in respect of authorship—to some not very juvenile member of the weaker sex. We are bound, however, to state, that his book has yet one further characteristic feature of womanhood. It attains to, and defends conclusions probably right, but does so by arguments of little worth, and considerable prolixity.

The correlation of our two volumes is further apparent when we pass from the title-page to the table of contents. We have a series of chapters in each, devoted to the consideration of the subject in connexion with religion, the argument from geology, the knowledge or hypotheses which we possess of the nebulæ, fixed stars, planets, and solar system, the discussion of objections, and finally, in each, the future of the universe. If all the knowable touching these transcendant subjects is comprised within the limits of these two volumes, then, indeed, we possess in these two Blue Books a valuable mass of evidence. Alas, for the satisfaction of intellect, we are led thereby to entirely diverse conclusions. In the one volume, a very bulky mass of very ponderous thought, ingenious argument, and elaborate dissertation, is expended in an effort to maintain a paradox, and overthrow a popular belief. In the other, a highly discursive strain of querulous remonstrance feebly advocates the established conviction,—sometimes by false philosophy—sometimes by random theory—sometimes by not indisputable analogy—and not seldom by mere bombast.

Before we enter upon the subject-matter of these doctors' disagreement, we must once more congratulate ourselves, not only that we have philosophers who can unbend the rigid constraint of inductive science, and stoop for awhile to the comparative puerilities of airy speculation; but, moreover, that the less deeply thinking public is not, as yet, so wholly immersed and engrossed in the grovelling round of mere

[1] The *third* grace seems to have its tribute of respect in the above-quoted lines of sentiment, which are immediately subjoined to the title.

Digitized by Google

material results, and positive acquisitions to the capital of ascertained *facts*, but that it greedily devours and discusses the guesses and counter-guesses of the wise.

Ever since the explosion of the old Ptolemaic doctrine, that our globe is the centre—if not the sum and substance—of all creation, a suspicion has been growing up, which has ranged, according to the constitution of different minds, from possibility to approximate conviction, that it may hold but a very insignificant position in the universe. Dislodged from its ancient security, and hurled from the patient shoulders of Atlas through devious paths of space, demonstrated to thread its way about some other and nobler body in labyrinthal spirals, which constitute a very trifling part in the mazes traced out by the wanderers of the sky, the venerable earth became less and less the subject of blind and self-complacent adoration. What had been demonstrated to hold good of its *physical* relation to the rest of the universe—that this world plays but a most subordinate part in the system of creation—naturally suggested itself as a possible condition of its moral and intellectual position. Just as in the progress from infancy to maturity one learns gradually to abandon the narrow notions of infancy; as one's sympathies expand by degrees beyond the family circle; as the child drops by degrees the idea that papa, mamma, and nurse are the three most important potentates in existence, for whom, in fact, everybody else exists; as, finally, he learns that there are other, and perhaps brighter, homes, filled with wealthier inhabitants, more numerous, more important, or more fair; so it has been with the conception of the well-informed concerning the brother spheroids of our own system, the kindred systems which, with ours, constitute the galaxy, and finally the dim hazy nebulæ, which seem at least to be the galaxies of immeasurably distant heavens. It is, of course, by very gradual steps that such huge and bold generalisations are adventured. The progress of the opinion of mankind hereon has been very analogous to that which has occurred in the growth of individual thought. Every thinking man can probably recollect the difficulty he once had in understanding how it was that the earth was 'round like an orange,' and not flat, in indefinite extension, as had appeared to him when, elevated beyond the capabilities of his little legs, he was allowed to observe creation over the adjoining hedges. Then came the *very* hard lesson, that he was by no means to consider himself as defining 'the top' of the world; that good people in the antipodes were *not* at all standing on their heads, nor topsy-turvy, nor in any other than his own fashion. A good deal of confusion of ideas, and a slight sensation of vertigo, attended his efforts to eman-

Digitized by Google

cipate himself from the idea that the sun really traversed the heavens. When the annual and diurnal motions had robbed him of all opinion of stability in all he had once considered immoveable, it remained to puzzle out how, so far from his own summer hay-fields and winter nights being the standard of the human family, there are people who experience every gradation of temperature, and every duration of day and night, from one hour to six months. At length, with repeated efforts and increasing years, the theory of his own globe is mastered. In spite of the confusion of ideas consequent on a consecutive perusal of 'Joyce's Scientific Dialogues,' he no longer imagines days to be long in summer, because things expand by heat, and to be short in winter, because they contract by cold. We cannot digress to trace the unobserved effect of other than astronomical studies, which, by a parallel advance, aid him in developing powers of generalisation, and in renouncing the foolish conceit that *his* interests, *his* world, *his* culture, and *he*, are the final causes and focal centre of all existence. From history, from classics, from art, and from politics, he learns the maxim, *nihil humani alienum puto;* from metaphysics and philosophy he learns to expand its scope even beyond the *humani omne*, as the *Times* in its peculiar Latinity would say; from religion he learns to feel sympathy with other than mundane matter; from all he learns to repudiate the absurdity, χρημάτων μέτρον ἄνθρωπος. Not that all this progress is won at the stage whither we have already conducted him; but such is the tendency, and such or such-like the indirect influences, of a liberal education. So is his way paved to the more ready reception of the arcana of astronomy. To learn that the planets weave their mystic dance, not only around another than his own globe, but without the slightest reference to it, and without the slightest perceptible effect, for good or for evil, on its fortunes, must no longer present a difficulty to his mind. Step by step, he is learning the comparative unimportance of his habitation; gradually the idea of his *own* unimportance in the whole creation opens upon him as not impossible. Strange analogies and curious conjectures force themselves upon him, as he learns and admires the reproduction, in the case of the planets, of contrivances and phænomena with which he is familiar, and which had seemed to be peculiarly adapted to the use of intelligent and sentient beings. If he has been in the habit of contemplating with grateful admiration the arrangement whereby one satellite supplies the absence of sunlight, and that chiefly and most energetically when most required, what shall he conclude from the furniture of other planets, which, like his own, have day and night, and which accordingly enjoy satellites

Digitized by Google

proportioned in number and position to their needs? If it be any legitimate step in the argument from design, that our moon is longer above the horizon, and rides higher in the zenith, when our nights are longest and darkest, to what but design shall he attribute the arrangement in the motions of Jupiter's satellites, whereby it is impossible they should all be at once below the horizon? If the rotation of our earth, and the inclination of its axis of revolution to its orbitual plane, produce such obvious and useful effects on the vicissitudes of days and seasons, what shall be supposed the purpose of the like phænomena in planets more noble in their proportions than our own?

We may well conceive such lines of thought to give rise to very curious conjectures in a contemplative mind, especially if the imagination be warm. But perhaps our astronomer, having learned many a lesson of cautious induction, and a wholesome dread of mere conjecture, in the school of practical science, forbears to proclaim, or even to encourage, the thoughts that brood within him. If strange fancies of previous existence on diverse orbs seem to him to involve, possibly, some distantly approximate solution of the mystic *ἀνάμνησις*, which comes at moments across us all, saying, 'I have been in this scene, or acted in this combination of circumstances before!' or if the congregation of different elements from different spheres on one terrestrial stage might haply account for the conflict of opinions, and sympathies, and interests around us, he checks such wandering imaginations as, perhaps, not altogether reverent, and certainly not as yet necessitated by any scientific induction. But still the semi-conviction remains,—'These wonders and 'complex systems were made for *some* use; their marvellous 'resemblance to our own suggests that that use was not wholly 'dissimilar from ours.'

We do not think that any valuable suggestion has ever been thrown out to explain the use of the planets to ourselves. There are, it would appear, persons to whom it seems satisfactory to imagine, that the kingly Jupiter with his attendant moons, the glorious Saturn and his triplicate girdle, the stately Uranus, and that 'interesting stranger,' whom the obstetric arts of Adams and Le Verrier guided to its birth (and whom the tardy incredulity of our observers has prevented our claiming as indisputably our own), exist, and have existed, only to win the admiring study of Chaldæan shepherds, to perplex the brains and tangled horoscopes of planet-stricken astrologers, to puzzle speculators, to furnish a 'Theory' for the Senate House, and finally to be gazed at by themselves through the great Northumberland! Or, perhaps, they deem it cause enough for the crea-

Digitized by Google

tion of Venus that she should, at rare intervals, transit the sun's disc, and determine our distance from that orb, while it may be sufficient reason for the existence of the other planets, that some such recondite use may be hereafter discovered for them also! Was ever dream so self-complacent? Had vision ever fabric so baseless? What is this but to bid 'the sun and the moon and the eleven stars to make obeisance unto *us?*' Meanwhile men are born, and struggle on, and die; and are reproduced in descendants, who are born, and struggle on, and die again; and what wot they of lunar theory and planetary disturbance, and determination of longitude, and exploded planets, and exploded theories? Yet without such information, it is certain that they can never learn the magnificent lessons which these orbs can teach the votaries of science, and which, we are told, are sufficient reason for their creation. If, then, it is for *man* that they were created, how is it that the overwhelming mass of men have not a single correct notion about them? For man? Why, of course they were, like all other of God's works, created (among other and, it may be, more special uses) for man! For all men to admire in the spangled firmament, for some men to study with more inquiring ken, for the thoughtful to exclaim, with deepest awe and humblest consciousness of insignificance: 'O Thou that hast set Thy glory above 'the Heavens, when I consider Thy Heavens, the work of Thy 'fingers, the moon and the stars which Thou hast ordained, 'what is man, that Thou art mindful of him, and the son of 'man, that Thou visitest him!' Of course, they were created for man! Incidentally, they may help him in his approach to God; but can we conceive, even on a survey of the planets alone, that those wondrous constitutions, of which the most splendid and the most delicate objects were never seen by any man, and of which the laws and harmony were utterly unintelligible to any man, before the age of Newton—can we conceive that those systems, which are even now utterly unknown to all but a few philosophers, and concerning which even philosophers' wisdom is comparative ignorance, were made *specially* for man?

How are these convictions strengthened by further insight into the universe? Every well educated man of the present age will have had thoughts such as we have sketched out before his mind. But they to whom Science has unrolled her ample page have further convictions based on, perhaps, we ought hardly to say higher *argument*, but, at all events, irresistible impressions. Unless, indeed, our star-gazers read, as read the astronomer of Uz, backwards, they can hardly fail to concede the force of argument to the analogies which negative

Digitized by Google

the barren solitude of the stars which pave Heaven's floor. Shall man arrogate to himself the lordship of the universe, when he finds the distance from the nearest of self-luminous bodies to his own to be all but immeasurable, and perfectly inconceivable? What, was it for me that all the dusted tract of the Milky Way has for ages and ages (if it be yet in existence) poured forth floods of light which is at my distance too feeble to be well perceptible? But perhaps it has ceased, long myriads ago, to exist at all. Supposing it to have done so, it is quite certain that I have no means of knowing it. Not even light itself could be a messenger speedy enough to announce it. Shall I imagine that the hazy fleeces of light, which, till a year or two ago, no telescope had revealed even thus imperfectly, exist but to puzzle my curiosity? Foolish thought! Is it not certain that there are millions of stars in the vaults of space which even the telescope of Lord Rosse will never reveal to me? even as there are multitudes of beasts and plants and monsters which earth and ocean hold beyond my ken below. Is it not possible that worlds have come into being, and have long ceased to be, of which no ray has yet brought intelligence to so remote a corner of space? And shall I imagine that these things exist for *me?*

We think that such a strain of thought cannot but be obvious to a very common-place thinker. No doubt it will assume different guises in different minds. Perhaps many people have never given it expression or shape, even to so slender an extent. Probably, not a few have developed it far beyond these meagre limits. But there is no doubt that it is immensely enhanced by probabilities of a religious character. It is true that religious thought has also its objections to offer, and its difficulties to suggest. It is certain that a religious frame of mind will rather prefer to stop short of, than to exceed the limits of reverent speculation. But without transgressing these limits, and deferring awhile the discussion of the difficulties which the insignificance of our world is supposed to occasion to pious minds, we may remark, that a vast deal of religious difficulty may find a possible mitigation in the theory to which our hypothetical astronomer cannot fail to have been conducted by such reflections as we have supposed him to indulge, although he may not have ventured to express it. The theory that the population of our globe forms but a mere speck in the intelligent and spiritual *Life* of the Universe of God, even as they and their abode constitute a mere atom in dimensions, suggests very obvious consolations to a mind overpowered and depressed by the sad aspect of things immediately around it. We do not remember to have seen it suggested in mitigation of the existence of evil, except in a small and ephemeral tract on 'Future Punishment,' which

Digitized by Google

appeared a few years ago at Cambridge. But the germ of the thought itself is contained in Butler's Works. And we know that the thought itself, that there are other nobler and purer worlds, which are free from taint and misery, has brought solace to minds which might else have staggered at the contemplation of the woe, past, present, and future, which this world holds out to view. This, for aught we know, may be the one stage and battle-field in the universe whereon the contest of right and wrong must be fought out. There may, as Bishop Butler tells us, be some *à priori* necessity in the very nature of things which renders the existence of evil necessary. That the great battle should be fought, that there should be somewhere exhibited a grand drama of probation, may be the sole condition of the ultimate glory and welfare of the vast majority. What if this small earth be the scene?

We desire to speak with all reverence on a very awful subject, about which God has left us in ignorance, and about which wisdom (if attainable) would perhaps be folly. But surely we shall not offend the most devout and humble mind, by stating the possibilities which have suggested themselves to patient thought, a-weary of a sinful world. Far be it from us to speculate too curiously, far less to utter dogmata on a theme whereon we are confessedly—and not, perhaps, deplorably—ignorant. But to us the perplexity which too dominant evil and pain force upon every thoughtful mind, seems so readily mitigated by the idea that there may be, rather than the belief that there are, multitudes of worlds where no such miseries have place, that we cannot but suffer it to bias the opinion, and to *suggest* the belief. That this world should be so trifling in magnitude and importance, compared with the countless orbs which throng throughout all space, seems, under such an aspect of things, only to suggest thoughts of grateful adoration. Here only, it may be, within these confined limits, may evil now abound. Here only may that painful sight be witnessed, of wrong and mischief apparently triumphant. And even here we know that fearful victory is but apparent. For here—*here only*—has an incarnate and suffering God deigned to wage the war, and vanquish the giant foe; exhibiting to all creation, by the spectacle of *such* a contest on such an unimportant world, the awful power and malignity of sin.

But here we pause. Reverence for sacred things, and a vivid sense of the incomparable superiority of revealed truth to speculative possibility, forbids our carrying theory further. Let us leave religious guess-work to the Millenarian.

But we must remark that thus far it would appear we might have been legitimately conducted, even if the *existence* of other

Digitized by Google

spheres and systems had been as hypothetical as is their use. Had there been no such science as Astronomy, pious thought might have engendered the wish, the hope, the opinion, that there might be other worlds. When to these possibilities—to say no more—are added the generalisations and analogies of physical science, opinion is strengthened until it becomes, if not belief, yet an impression of no ordinary strength, that the highest of God's known creations, intelligent spiritual natures, find their counterpart, or are far transcended in the inhabitants of starry systems.

To such conclusions, as we before remarked, does a liberal education appear to conduct the individual intellect. Such are the directions in which the drift of well-informed popular conviction has steadily set. Such are the notions which the works before us profess to sift. How do our philosophers discuss them?

One of the most distinguished ornaments of one of the most distinguished bodies in the world, has put forth a volume on the opinions in question. Like all his other works, it evidences very great faculties of mind, very comprehensive capacity of intellect, very extensive acquaintance with every branch of physical science; moreover, very clumsy and disorderly notions of logic, and a marvellous inelegance in the use of English. We have a very methodical way of reading books. We first read the title outside; then the title inside; next the preface; and then the contents. We shall say no more respecting the title-page than we have already remarked; only observing, in passing, that the author would appear to consider, from his choice of title, that language is an instrument for the concealment of thought. On passing to the table of contents, we beg leave to submit that it is startling to find all the 'CONTENTS[1] OF THE PLURALITY OF WORLDS' on a single page! What we had expected were, 'Contents of Of the Plurality of Worlds; an Essay.' We must confess our disappointment at the confused arrangement, and bewildering method, which this table presents to our view. Would that men would condescend to think according to the obvious laws of thought, or at least to refrain from imposing on others the task of unravelling their own perplexities! Why cannot a man, who has bestowed so much thought on his subject as our author displays, be at the pains to arrange his own ideas before he begins to write? It is perfectly obvious that the author of 'OF, &c.' never sketches out an analysis of the subject-matter before him, and of the mode in which it shall be handled. His writing reminds one,

[1] Altered in later editions.

Digitized by Google

in respect of order, of a foot-ball match, as played at the wall at Eton,—but it is destitute of the vigour and force of that onset. As for symmetry, we should sooner look to find it in a potato. If the author's object, in the arrangement of the initial index to matter and form, which one expects in a table of contents, was to hinder one from seeing through his drift without reading his work, he has undoubtedly attained it. If it was to deter one from such perusal, he has certainly done it efficiently. But if it was to clear one's notions of his purpose, and suggest to the gentle reader the expediency of following the wake of his method, then this page is waste-paper.

'Chapter I. Astronomical Discoveries.'—Very good: what next? 'Chapter II.' The Conclusions they suggest? Oh no, 'Astronomical Objection to Religion.'—Why, this must be a treatise on the various fruits and tendencies of Astronomy. 'Chapter III.' may probably be Astronomy in its Relations to Chemistry,—or, Astronomy *versus* Common Sense. But no, it is, 'The Answer from the Microscope.' 'Chapter IV. Further Statement of the Difficulty.' *What* difficulty? Well, perhaps the objection took the form of a difficulty; and in that case we shall look in Chapter V. for Further Answer from the Kaleidoscope. But no such symmetry prevails. We are now conducted into 'Geology,' and 'The Argument [pray, or what?] from Geology;' and next, by a leap, like that with which mathematicians are familiar, from $+\infty$ to $-\infty$, we find ourselves in 'The Nebulæ'—whence we are brought down again, by gradual steps, to 'The Solar System,' and 'The Argument from Design,' 'The Unity of the World,' and 'The Future;' titles vague enough to be prefixed to chapters in almost any conceivable writing on almost any conceivable subject.

The work opens with some comments on the sublime passage which we have already quoted from the eighth Psalm, in which natural religion assumes its best and wisest form, and descants on the comparative insignificance of the creature who enjoys God's grace and favour, rather than on his dignity and worth. There is nothing very remarkable in our author's disquisition on this magnificent aspiration; except that, as is usual in paraphrase, commentary, and the like, the grandeur of the sentiment is frittered away, and well-nigh evaporated, in the dissertation; and that there is a most unwarrantable assumption in the observation: 'We may be certain that the Psalmist regarded 'the stars as things [things!] *having a reference to the earth*, and 'yet not resembling the earth; as works of God's fingers, very 'different from the earth with its tribes of inhabitants; as 'luminaries, not worlds.' We beg to demur to this comment on King David's meaning. We beg to assert, at least, an equal

Digitized by Google

'certainty,' that he understood nothing of the kind. We are far from asserting that inspired authors had necessarily any peculiar insight into the laws of nature; but, at the same time, it is most true that, even under the influence of poetry or enthusiasm, men rise above themselves, and enunciate daring conceptions, which nothing appears at the time to warrant to ordinary minds, but which the progress of science fully justifies. Why *less* should be attributed to the effusions of men moved by the Holy Ghost, it would be hard for our author to show.

However, this may pass. The author of the essay leaves his criticisms on the astral theology of the royal Hebrew, and proceeds to raise, or, as he would say, to state, a difficulty propounded in the form of an objection to religion. We should imagine that there are very few people now-a-days who would base an objection to revealed truth on the assumption, that other worlds besides our own are inhabited. Such an objector it has never been[1] our misfortune to meet, either in person or in print. However, it seems that Dr. Chalmers considered such a fault-finder as representing a class not unworthy of refutation.

'He supposes an objector to take his stand upon the multiplicity of worlds, assumed or granted as true; and to argue that, since there are so many worlds besides this, all alike claiming the care, the government, the goodness, the interposition, of the Creator, it is in the highest degree extravagant and absurd, to suppose that he has done, for this world, that which religion, both natural and revealed, represents Him as having done, and as doing.

'* * * * If religion requires us to assume, that one particular corner of the universe has been thus singled out, and made an exception to the general rules by which all other parts of the universe are governed; she makes, it may be said, a demand upon our credulity, which cannot fail to be rejected by those who are in the habit of contemplating and admiring those general laws. Can the earth be thus the centre of the moral and religious universe, when it has been shown to have no claim to be the centre of the physical universe? Is it not as absurd to maintain this, as it would be to hold, at the present day, the old Ptolemaic hypothesis, which places the earth in the centre of the heavenly motions, instead of the newer Copernican doctrine, which teaches that the earth revolves around the sun? Is not religion disproved, by the necessity under which she lies of making such an assumption as this?'

Now the obvious answer to the fancied objector—this man of straw whom Dr. Chalmers erected to knock down, and whom the essayist sets on his legs again, in order that *he* may have

[1] We believe that there have been such; Tom Paine and, it is said, Horace Walpole raised the difficulty. And there may be some few pious and humble minds by whom it is really felt as one. That it should be a formidable one to any can only arise from a confusion of thought, and a forgetfulness that no *guess*, however probable it might appear to reason, can be a legitimate stumbling-block to Faith. Nothing but mental infirmity will find scruples in a *probability*, in which, if a revealed *certainty*, the mind would humbly acquiesce.

Digitized by Google

a bout with him—lies in a brief compass. In the first place, the *assumption* is not that of religion, but entirely that of the objector. *If* the multiplicity of worlds leads him into difficulties, let him remember that that doctrine, however probable, is only an assumption when used as the basis for an argument. In the next place, we may freely admit that such a further 'assumption,' as is here imputed to religion, would be absurd, and is *not* one which religion 'requires us to assume.' It might be added, by way of retort, that there are religious considerations, as we have before suggested, which seem rather to discountenance than to support the notion, that the earth is 'the centre of the moral and religious universe.'

But, instead of proceeding in any such fashion, the author of the essay deals with the objectors very much as ill-natured people say we have been dealing with our Russian foes. One would think this imaginary sceptic was 'a friend of forty years' standing!' 'Perhaps, however, we shall make our rea-'sonings and speculations apply to a wider class of readers, if 'we consider the view now spoken of, not as an objection, urged 'by an opponent of religion, but rather,[1] as a difficulty, felt by 'a friend of religion.' And then, like a fighter who has shaken hands with his antagonist on entering the lists, he proceeds to contest the difficulty. But how? In the following chapter, by alleging an argument which, so far forth as it is an argument, can only strengthen it; and in the rest of an elaborate, learned, but ill-arranged essay, by advancing various considerations and many arbitrary speculations, with the single purpose of cutting away from the objector the ground on which he built his objection; the position, 'assumed or granted as true,' of the existence of a multiplicity of worlds.

In all this there is a marvellous confusion of purpose and design—not to say a generally deficient apprehension of the subject-matter. Of the plurality of worlds, this essay does indeed dispute, albeit in a roundabout manner. But the introduction of Chalmers, and the imaginary sceptic, and the 'friend to religion,' is *οὐδὲν πρὸς Διόνυσον*. It is worse, for it is not simply otiose; it embarrasses and perplexes the argument. We have to complain, then, not merely of a careless arrangement and inelegant style, but, (1.) That the objection proposed is non-existent or unimportant. (2.) That the objection is not summarily disposed of, as it obviously might be, by the plea that it is based on an assumption—'the multiplicity of worlds, assumed or granted as true.' (3.) Nor yet is it met by showing that such assumption is perfectly consistent with religious

[1] The punctuation, we take leave to observe, is *not* our own.

Digitized by Google

truth. (4.) But it is transmogrified from an inimical objection into a 'friendly difficulty.' (5.) And it is met by adducing microscopical researches, which do but enhance it. (6.) And *it* is made the ground for a dissertation on a perfectly distinct, though deeply interesting question, whether the 'assumption' be probably correct.

Truly a most clumsy and confused way of entering upon what is really the subject-matter of the book! As clumsy as the following sentences, and as confused as the ideas which induced their writer to embody identical propositions in so elaborate and unwieldy a form. 'Of course,' says our author, at the close of his chapter on the objection, 'Of course it is 'natural that the views which are used by unbelievers as argu- 'ments against religious belief, should create difficulties and 'troubles in the minds of believers; at least, till the argument 'is rebutted. And, of course, also, the answers to the argu- 'ments, considered as infidel arguments, would operate to remove 'the difficulties which believers entertain on such grounds.'— Of course![1]

We have asserted that the answer which the microscope is supposed to furnish to the difficulty, is no answer at all. This point deserves some elucidation.

'Among the thoughts, which, it was stated, might naturally arise in men's minds, when the telescope revealed to them an innumerable multitude of worlds, was this: That the Governor of the Universe, who has so many worlds under His management, cannot be conceived as bestowing upon this earth, and its various tribes of inhabitants, that care which, till then, natural religion had taught men that He does employ, to secure to man the possession and use of his faculties of mind and body; and to all animals, the requisites of animal existence and animal enjoyment. And upon this, Chalmers remarks, that just about the time when science gave rise to the suggestion of this difficulty, she also gave occasion to a remarkable reply to it. * * * * * The telescope brought into view worlds as numerous as the drops of water which make up the ocean; the microscope brought into view a world in almost every drop of water. Infinity in one direction was balanced by infinity in the other.'

It would surely be a very poor way of explaining to a learner his difficulty in conceiving how the branch of a parabola above the axis can be constantly bending towards it, yet ever receding from it, and that to an indefinite distance, if you told him that

[1] Before leaving this chapter it deserves notice that the learned author appears to have made an error in stating the relative positions of the two exterior orbits of our system. 'Beyond Saturn, and almost twice as far from the Sun, Herschel discovers Uranus, another great planet; and again beyond Uranus, and again at nearly twice *his* distance, &c.' Now Bode's celebrated law asserted the intervals between each successive *pair of orbits* to be about double of the preceding interval. And this law is remarkably violated in the case of Neptune, as indeed our author has himself observed elsewhere.

Digitized by Google

the same thing occurs in the branch *below* the axis, and 'that infinity in one direction is balanced by infinity in the other.' The obvious deduction from the revelations of the microscope is this; that there is no such mean limit as man has been accustomed to place to his Creator's power and providence; that what is ever more and more discovered in miniature may very probably have its counterpart in giant forms; that the discovery of new worlds close to us, renders nugatory any *à priori* objections against the existence of new worlds at vast distances from us; and that among the foolish 'thoughts which might naturally arise in men's minds,' the above-stated was one of the most foolish. Such would be the conclusion deduced by a man free from the alleged difficulty. But to a man who sincerely felt it, the discovery of microscopic worlds could only enhance and multiply it; in proportion as 'fresh worlds' were brought under the 'management of the Governor of the Universe' to interfere with 'that care which, till then, natural religion, &c.' Yet our author concludes, 'The discovery of 'new worlds at vast distances from us, was accompanied by the 'discovery of new worlds close to us; and was thus rendered 'ineffective to disturb the belief of those who had regarded the 'world as having God for its Governor. This is a striking 'reflexion.'

Chiefly so from its extremely illogical conclusion. Wherefore we cannot but wish, for the credit of our writer, and the comfort and clearness of thought of his readers, that he had proceeded to his real subject without all this verbose introduction on astronomical discoveries, astronomical objections, and microscopical answers; more especially as the difficulty he raises has, after all, no great force. For, as he himself concludes, in a sentence whereof the readers will (in obedience to the old rule) count *one* at each comma: 'It is not likely that any one, who 'had formed his conceptions of the Divine Mind from its mani-'festations in the production and sustentation of animal, as well 'as vegetable life, on this earth, would have his belief in the 'operation of such a mind, shaken, by any necessity which 'might be impressed upon him, of granting the existence of 'animal life on other planets, as well as on the earth, or even 'on innumerable such planets, and on innumerable systems of 'planets and worlds, system above system.'

Yes, here we are at last; brought, no doubt, to the right result, though by a most crooked path, and at last by floundering through a perfect shingle of commas! What is our consternation on turning the page to meet with a 'further statement of the difficulty!' We shall not weary our readers with any lengthy disquisition of this extraordinary chapter.

Digitized by Google

Starting with a grotesque and clumsy hypothesis[1] that 'we 'were to see, on the face of the full moon, a figure gradually 'becoming visible, representing a right-angled triangle, with a 'square constructed on each of its three sides as a base,'—as if, even on the supposition of there being *human* beings in the moon, it were not pre-eminently absurd to imagine that their selenometry[2] must be at all analogous to our geometry,—or that if they *have* Euclids with I. xlvii. all complete, that proposition must needs claim for *them* the admiration which we concede it;—the writer on the plurality of worlds discusses, in a rambling sort of a way, the general theory and conditions of intellectual progress. Advance is shown to be a necessary attribute of mental and moral existences. And all this in order to dilate on the self-evident proposition that: 'Even if there be intelligent 'inhabitants in the moon, or in the planets, it does not follow 'that they have any sympathy with us, or any community of 'knowledge:' a proposition which, so far from seeming to us to discredit the theory of a plurality of worlds, is, on the contrary, one of the most probable features in it. If science told us nothing of other spheres, how eminently unphilosophical would be the assumption that their tenants were modelled, physically or intellectually, upon one type! How does every branch of positive science demonstrate that such a conjecture would be not only unsafe, but improbable. It may be hard to imagine to ourselves the forms and qualities of moral and intellectual creatures distinct from mankind; but it would have been equally hard for angels, or other beings, to conceive of *man* before the Creator had modelled him, after His own image, and not upon any external type. It is necessarily impossible to picture to ourselves any object upon which none of our natural senses can be brought to bear; because, as Victor Cousin has so admirably shown, in his critique on Locke's Philosophy, the mind possesses its latent ideas all undeveloped and unexpressed until the operation of sensible impressions fertilises the womb of thought; and calls out into actuality and activity the ideas which lay dormant there. Hence the difficulty of imagining to oneself, or explaining to others, any object of mere abstract thought. The terms we use, when we employ language for the purpose, are all borrowed from the domain of sense; and thus

[1] This strange and monstrous conception is, we believe, due to the originality of the gallant and eccentric Col. Thompson. He proposed to carve the figures above-described, in gigantic proportions upon Salisbury Plain, in the hope to elicit a response from the dwellers in the moon.

[2] Of course the established relations of space are absolutely true everywhere, in the moon as well as in the earth. But her mathematical appliances may as far transcend our geometry and trigonometry, as these do the old arts of the Nilometricians [not however that *we* think it even probable the moon is a peopled world.]

Digitized by Google

the very vehicle and medium of our thought reminds us of the great disadvantages under which we labour, in attempting to discourse definitely about what is not the object of palpable sensation.

But were we never so fertile and happy in our imaginings, how wild and visionary it would be to presume to people other worlds with creatures of our own imagination! We may, if we like to be absurd, people another planet with sentient and intelligent forms—we can scarcely call them *men*—that shall combine all the hideous devices of ancient Indian, Egyptian, and Grecian mythologies—or we may devise new shapes, beings with three legs, and possessed each of two minds, one of which is active, while the other takes its sleep. But, even if our notions were not necessarily and painfully grotesque, a well disciplined mind would at once recoil from any arbitrary assumptions of the kind, as unphilosophical. The problem is one in which the number of equations is utterly insufficient for the evaluation of all the unknown relations of the quantities involved. And even if the conditions were all ascertained, it by no means follows that we could solve a single one of them.

But the fact is, that modern science has told us a great deal about other worlds; and her intelligence furnishes us with a certain number of conditions which we can exhibit in, at any rate, an approximately explicit form. It is true that the information they afford us is negative. They only strip the possible inhabitants of other worlds of certain habits, or forms, or enjoyments, which obtain among ourselves. They supply no positive intelligence as to their actual mode of existence. They merely restrict it, in certain respects, within certain limits. Thus:—

'When' we consider the physical peculiarities and probable condition of the several planets, so far as the former are known by observation, or the latter rest on probable grounds of conjecture, three features principally strike us as necessarily productive of extraordinary diversity in the provisions by which, if they be like our earth inhabited, animal life must be supported. These are—first, the difference in their respective supplies of light and heat from the sun; secondly, the difference in the intensities of the gravitating forces which must subsist at their surfaces, or the different ratios, which, on their several globes, the *inertiæ* of bodies must bear to their *weights;* and, thirdly, the difference in the nature of the materials of which, from what we know of their mean density, we have every reason to believe they consist. The intensity of solar radiation is nearly seven times greater on Mercury than on the earth, and on Uranus 330 times less: the proportion between the two extremes being that of upwards of 2,000 to one. Let any one figure to himself the condition of our globe, were the sun to be septupled, to say nothing of the greater ratio! or were it diminished to a seventh, or to a 300th of its actual power. 'Again, the

[1] Herschel, Outlines of Astronomy, p. 310.

Digitized by Google

intensity of gravity, or its efficacy in counteracting muscular power, and repressing animal activity, on Jupiter is nearly two and a-half times that on the earth, on Mars not more than one-half, on the Moon one-sixth, and on the smaller planets probably not more than one-twentieth: giving a scale of which the extremes are in the proportion of sixty to one. Lastly, the density of Saturn hardly exceeds one-eighth of the mean density of the Earth, so that it must consist of materials not much heavier than cork. Now, under the various combinations of elements so important to life as these, what immense diversity must we not admit in the conditions of that great problem, the maintenance of animal and intellectual existence and happiness, which seems, so far as we can judge by what we see around us in our own planet, and by the way in which every corner of it is crowded with living beings, to form an unceasing and worthy object for the exercise of the Benevolence and Wisdom which presides over all!"

The climate of the Moon is of the most extraordinary kind. Her *day* is a fortnight long—whence the heat and glare of the side exposed to the Sun, must exceed anything of the kind felt in the desert—and is suddenly succeeded, without the intervention of a moment's twilight, by a corresponding night of the keenest cold. From the small mass of the material of which she is constructed, it follows that muscular force would produce six times the effect that it does with us. But the want of any air, and the probable absence of any fluids, render it impossible that the Moon should be tenanted by any forms of life analogous to our own. Regarded by itself, this ought to present little or no obstacle to a theory of life in other globes. The glorious wisdom and omnipotence of the Creator may doubtless be exhibited on as noble a scale in a world where any atmosphere would *drown* its denizens as here. What renders it no necessary part of that theory that the Moon should be tenanted, is the fact that the Moon has an obvious use of another kind. The question is, Have the planets any such obvious use for us as our satellite has, and as *their* satellites would appear, by parity of analogy, to subserve for them? Jupiter's satellites are occasionally, even frequently eclipsed. This phenomenon occasioned to us the discovery of the rate of light; and serves roughly to determine longitude at sea. But will any one contend that this is sufficient, as a final cause of his creation? Such an hypothesis would be as ridiculous as the theory that he is but another and a miniature moon to us. Hanging in resplendent, though very distant radiance over the waters, his dancing gleam may serve to beguile the tedious hours of the mariner, or may lend a silver charm to the brief hour of lovers' converse. And if it lifts the hearts of these to the wise and good Father Who holds all in equipoise, it is well. But has it no other meaning, no more independent reason for existence?

Such is the thought which will, again and again, steal over us, in spite of all the labored and devious lucubrations of our

Digitized by Google

learned author. It is utterly unworthy of an enlarged and philosophical line of thought, to limit our conceptions of other life to the forms around us. It was utterly unnecessary, therefore, that 'The Essay' should drag us tediously through such false assumptions as that 'Intelligence . . . . implies a history of intellectual development;' or such unhappy mistakes as that moral and religious progress 'has been far more extensively aimed at than a progress in abstract and general knowledge;' and 'has been, in many nations, and in a very great measure, really effected.' These labored premisses were, we repeat it, unnecessary in order to establish the conclusion (falsely, however, deduced from *them*) that Jupiter and Saturn can have no inhabitants analogous to men. It is not because it would be 'too bold an assumption to speak of the conscience of an inhabitant of Jupiter,' that we do not speculate concerning such matters, but simply because it is needless, and, in the absence of all data, unphilosophical. It is worthy of the author of a moral and metaphysical Euclid, to assume that 'When 'we attempt to extend our sympathies to the inhabitants of 'other planets and other worlds, and to regard them as living 'like us under a moral government, we are driven to suppose 'them to be, in all essential respects, human beings like our-'selves;' but the assumption is untrue. What proof have we of this? 'In all the attempts which have been made, with 'whatever licence of hypothesis and fancy, to present to us 'descriptions and representations of the inhabitants of other 'parts of the universe.' Marvellous indeed! Because absurd 'attempts *have been* made,' '*we* are driven' to be absurd and unphilosophical also! We beg leave to say, 'speak for yourself, oh author,' for as he himself immediately afterwards observes, 'There is no more wisdom or philosophy in believing 'such assemblages of beings to exist in Jupiter or Sirius, with-'out evidence, than in believing them to exist in the island of 'Formosa, with the like absence of evidence.'

'Since we know nothing about the inhabitants of Jupiter, 'true science requires that we say and suppose nothing about 'them.' Most true, with the single exception of their *existence*, and the very few conditions which we *do* know respecting its possible modes. Thus a most unnecessary array of false argument is collected to establish a conclusion which nobody denies, and which has no reference to the single topic of discussion.

We trust there may be nothing more than inadvertence in the meagre and not over-reverent phraseology, which in exalting the worth and dignity of man, and man's world, can speak of our Blessed Saviour as 'a special Messenger (!) whom in the

Digitized by Google

fulness of time, God sent upon the earth in the form of a man,' and in the typographical distinctions which speak of God's 'revealing *His* purpose . . by a Divine messenger, preceded by prophetic announcements of *his* coming.' But this sort of inadvertence is always to be regretted; and we cannot but deplore that so very learned and pious a man as our author shows himself to be, should rarely suffer any symptoms to betray that he considers *Christian* privileges, *Christian* tempers, *Christian* hopes, to be the only perfect 'glory and worship,' wherewith man is crowned; and *Christianity*, rather than intellectual 'dignity,' or even 'moral progress,' to be the normal condition of humanity. Everywhere we meet with a supreme reverence for MAN. He is honoured with all the distinctions which initial types, emphatic collocation, and wearisome repetition can bestow. 'MAN . . . . is an intelligent, moral, religious, and spiritual creature.'—'Man and Mankind.'—'Man is capable of, &c.'—'Man has occupied his thoughts.'—'Man is also capable of, &c.'—'He is, &c.' 'Perhaps man, &c.'; and, finally, 'Man is naturally, and reasonably, the greatest object of interest to man,' and to none apparently more so than to the author. Indeed, if there be such a religion as Anthropolatry, we conceive our essayist to be its Hierophant. And it would appear throughout his book, as if he were uneasy under an unconfessed, and perhaps unconscious feeling of humiliation, at so dignified a creature as man being made the tenant of so mean a globe as ours. He seems to deem it necessary to adduce every consideration which may mitigate the apparent disproportion. And the whole book seems based on this idea—if it can be said, indeed, to have any settled idea whatever. It conveys to one the impression of a somewhat rambling and verbose apology for the residence of the noblest of created existences in one of the smallest of the many mansions which he eyes.

The most valuable portion of this remarkable volume, is the two chapters on Geology; and, perhaps, the most original part of it is a chapter on The Nebulæ. It is not our intention to present our readers with an abstract of the very excellent geological sketch here displayed, for there is nothing new in the facts or the inferences deduced from them. We ought, however, to make one significant exception. It is, we believe, in this treatise, that geology has been made to contribute analogies, for the first time, to the consideration of the question before us. And though the argument is highly ingenious, and is not without its force, we conceive that it will scarcely be reproduced. For it appears to us to have very little weight, as compared with that steady and cumulative reasoning which our author endeavours to overthrow; and which he has scarcely met with any

Digitized by Google

other real analogy than the geological. But let him state it for himself:—

'When Geology tells us that the earth, which has been the seat of human life for a few thousand years only, has been the seat of animal life for myriads, it may be, millions of years, she has a right to offer this, as an answer to any difficulty which astronomy, or the readers of astronomical books, may suggest, derived from the consideration that the Earth, the seat of human life, is but one globe of a few thousand miles in diameter, among millions of other globes, at distances millions of times as great.'

There is certainly a great degree of plausibility[1] in this analogy, and it is forcibly put at considerable length, and in divers forms, by our author. *Valeat quantum.* But after all we do not *know*, even concerning our own earth, that it was untenanted by intelligent, moral, and religious beings in the bygone ages of its existence. That we find no remains in human form, may render it extremely improbable that such are to be found; may render it unlikely that *man* ever walked this globe before the creation of Adam. Indeed, the spirit of Scripture would seem to negative the supposition with more of certainty than the revelations of geology. But we must earnestly protest against the unwarranted assumption that, because we find no remains like unto our own, therefore no sentient and intellectual creatures can have preceded us. We must here quote our author against himself:—

'Not only does the analogy of creation not point to any such entire resemblance of similar parts, as is thus assumed, but it points in the opposite direction. Not entire resemblance, but universal difference is

[1] The above argument, as applied to the religious thinker, involves precisely the same fallacy as the 'Answer from the Microscope;' enhancing, in fact, the (so-called) *religious* difficulty, while it has considerable force as an analogy in removing a *philosophical* or intellectual one. Geology 'has a right to offer the above as an answer' to any analogy the astronomer may assert, or any difficulty he may raise on the supposed waste of space—just as the microscope offers *her* discoveries as a *confirmation* of such analogy—but neither can offer the least help to a man laboring under the difficulty, 'How can I believe all I am told of man, when I find him occupying so infinitesimal a part of Space?' It is a sort of *argumentum ad hominem* to say to him, 'You *do* manage to believe the same under the same difficulty with regard to *Time*,' but this argument can only raise fresh scruples in his mind. We admit the force of the analogy *as against a probable Plurality of Worlds*, and leave it to pair off with the Microscopic Analogies. There seems to be some difficulty in apprehending exactly *what is* the religious difficulty. Is it that he for whom Christ died should inhabit so *minute* a home? Then his ephemeral existence as a tenant even there does but increase the difficulty. Is it that he should inhabit so minute a home *among all other* homes? Then certainly Geology may offer her analogies from time, to neutralise the suggestion from space that there *are* any other homes. The objection very likely enters different minds in different forms, and probably not without some confusion of thought. To us it does not appear formidable; but, if any, it would assume rather the former shape. And thus it would be of nearly the same force when the Plurality of Inhabited Worlds was disproved.

Digitized by Google

what we discover . . . . not uniformity and a fixed type of existences, but progression and a climax.'

We decline to speculate on the possible forms of our possible predecessors, or on the possibility of their having been translated to another home. But we strenuously deny that the absence of a particular type of vertebrate mammals among geological fossils, is any *proof* that we were the first rational tenants of this sphere; or that it affords even a presumption that our race are 'the people, and wisdom shall die with them.'

We have already animadverted on our author's extraordinary respect for the species to which he belongs. This is not limited to a deep sense of the importance and responsibility attaching to free moral agents—nor to a grateful acknowledgment of the gifts of reason and intelligence. 'As an intellectual creature, 'he has not only an intelligence which he can apply to 'practical uses . . . . but also an intellect by which he can 'speculate about the relations of things, in their most general 'form; for instance, the properties of space and time, the 'relations of finite and infinite. . . . These are conditions to 'which the creation conforms, that is, to which the Creator conforms'—'*that is*, to which the *Creator* conforms'!! Without dilating on this grievous and palpable tendency to a pantheistic view of things, we will say only that we should prefer to have read, 'which the Creator *imposes*.' But we can never tolerate so cool an assumption, as that man's intellect is capable of 'speculation about the relation of things in their *most* general form.' It may be so. But it is at least equally likely that it is not so. The properties of space and time, for example, are among the 'most general' and abstract forms of which *we* have any conception; but they are not necessarily so in absolute omniscience. They are so ἐφ' ἡμῖν—who shall venture to add καὶ ἁπλῶς? On the contrary, they appear to be either conditions or accidents of *finite* existence; and they may very possibly be resolved into far higher generalisations in a future state. Yes, Sir Essayist, even I. xlvii. which seems to you so glorious and indelible an achievement of man's (MAN'S) dignities and intelligence, may hereafter appear a truism, or at best an axiom! Therefore, we object to the above assertion on your part, worded as it is 'in its most general form.'

But if our author seems inclined to over-estimate the elevation of man's apprehensions in matters of objective truth, he fully compensates for this by the extraordinary manner in which he makes the reality of spiritual life to rest on subjective opinion. We have seldom met with a more palpable avowal, that 'truth is what a man troweth,' than is comprised in the following passage, designed to establish, in a different way, the

Digitized by Google

worthiness of human nature, and its claim to Divine regard—'Man is capable in no small degree of a spiritual existence, of 'intercourse with God; and, as we are authorized to term it, of 'such a life with God, and in God, even while he continues in 'his present human existence. I say *authorized*, because'—Why, do you suppose, gentle reader? because the Bible teaches of a 'life hid with Christ in God?'—'because such expressions 'are used, though reverently, by the most religious men; *who 'are, at any rate, authority* as to their own sentiments; which 'are the basis of our reasoning!' *We* are authorized, because *others* have certain sentiments, to make *their* opinions the basis of *our* reasoning! Then it is to be πάντων μέτρον ἄνθρωπος (MAN!) after all!

Before we quit entirely the author's argument from geology, we must observe, that even if we were to concede his assertion, that 'we are compelled by geological evidences, to admit 'that a destitution of creatures who can know, obey, and worship 'God, has existed upon the earth during a far longer period 'than the whole duration of man's race,' we should still demur to the conclusion analogically inferred, 'that if other planets, 'and other stars, are the seats of habitation, it is rather of such 'habitation as has prevailed upon the earth during the millions, 'than during the six thousand years'—at least we vehemently protest against the conclusion, that *such* are their *permanent* inhabitants. There is a fallacy in the insidious transition from the past to the present tense. Such a state 'has existed on the earth;' therefore 'it is' the state of the planets. Say rather that analogy suggests it 'has been' also their condition; surmise if you will (from the preponderance of millions over 6,000 years) that it is their state even now: but in all fairness admit that the analogy, if pursued to its close, suggests a glorious sequence to their sometime chaotic state.

To investigate with any precision the curious and original theories which our author throws out with respect to the Nebulæ, would involve us in dynamics of too recondite a form. We will content ourselves by remarking, that the Nebular hypothesis, *i.e.*, the theory that our system, and any other systems which may be in existence, were framed by the gradual consolidation of a vortex of highly attenuated matter, does not stand the test of refined mathematical analysis. We are sorry to find anything approaching to the exploded doctrines of vortices (so ingeniously propounded by Des Cartes) receiving the support of so learned and weighty an author. Every succeeding revelation of the telescope has afforded fresh conviction to astronomers, that the Nebulæ are vast assemblages of distinct luminaries, and not enormous conglomerates of rarefied star-dust. Perhaps

Digitized by Google

it may be sufficient, as a popular argument, to object against our author's theory, that it supposes a highly rarefied fog (as it were) of revolving matter to possess sufficient luminosity to become visible by our telescopes; whereas we learn from its immeasurable, its inconceivable distance, that an intensely brilliant object, like our own sun, would be incapable of affecting the retina, even with all aids and appliances of optical art, did *it* occupy the place of a nebula. We may, therefore, dismiss, as the products of a mind determined to sacrifice philosophy to paradox, the strange conceptions that 'Nebulæ are of a granulated or curdled texture: they have run into *lumps* of light, or have been formed originally of such lumps. Highly curious.' Highly curious indeed! and not a little crude.

One can hardly reconcile the grave philosophy of an astronomer with such an intimation as the following:—

'If we were to say that the spiral nebulæ appear mere shapeless masses, flung off in the work of creating solar systems, we might perhaps disturb those who are resolved to find everywhere worlds like ours; but it seems difficult to suggest any other reason for not saying so.'

We will not imitate the rash conjectures of the Nebulæ theorist; or we could easily multiply theories, the most improbable of which should afford sufficient 'reason for not saying so.' But we have the best reason for 'not saying so,' in the consideration that it is not the method of the Creator to 'fling off shapeless masses' from his handiwork—and it is scarcely reverent in the creature to attribute to Him such a *modus operandi*. Were it not for our personal knowledge and assurance that we should malign him—were it not for a chain of pious and reverent reflections even in the present work—we should not hesitate to attribute irreverence to the writer of such language. As it is, we gladly content ourselves with expressing our own dislike of such theories. We shrink with awe from such speculations, as that 'Meteoric stones are bits of planets, which have failed in the making, and lost their way, till arrested by the resistance of the earth's atmosphere;' and again, 'The planets and the stars 'are the lumps which have flown from the potter's wheel of the 'Great Worker; the shred coils which, in the working, sprang 'from His mighty lathe;—the sparks which darted from His 'awful anvil when the solar system lay incandescent thereon;— 'the curls of vapour which rose from the great cauldron of 'creation when its elements were separated.' Such language may be figurative, and may seem to be no more; to us it appears painful, and we prefer to contrast it with the author's expression of 'undoubting trust,' (we hasten to state our honest conviction of his entire sincerity,) 'that any view of the creation

Digitized by Google

'which is found to be true, will also be found to supply material 'for reverential contemplation.'

From his ingenious but fanciful speculations on the Nebulæ, (which he henceforward regards as established truths), the essayist passes to similar conclusions for the Fixed-stars and planets. By a gradual process of ingenious paradox, and arbitrary assumption, they are robbed of almost every attribute which has been hitherto accorded them. The Fixed-stars are not foci of life; because, 'as we have seen, the Nebulæ are not centres of inhabited systems.' And, inasmuch as *the Moon* (which evidently waits in a subordinate position on an inhabited sphere) bears little trace of life, it is concluded that 'our best chance of learning whether' the *planets* are inhabited, militates against the theory of a plurality of worlds. Step by step, we are led into conclusions more and more paradoxical, till at last we are told 'the Earth is really the largest planetary body in the solar system!' and are brought to the extraordinary proposition, 'that the Earth is inhabited, is not a reason for believing 'that the other planets are so, but for believing that they are 'not so.'

We gladly pass on to notice a very striking chapter on the Argument from Design. In our opinion this chapter is (as an effort of argument) worth all the rest of the book. The rest of the book contains several things that are new, and several things that are true. Unhappily, the things that are true (*vide* chapter on geology) are not new; and those that are new (as of the Nebulæ) are scarcely true. A cosmical theory is spun out hardly more probable than the gorgeous vision of the distaff-balanced universe at the close of Plato's Polity; and with scarcely less assumption of a docile and assenting audience. But the reader must outvie the submissiveness of a Glaucon who can answer ἔγωγε to every οὔκουν of our author's. However, in the chapter on Design, he really addresses himself to the gist of the argument *pro* and *con;* and though we do not concur in his conclusions, we must confess there is a great deal of beautiful thought, and even eloquent writing in this chapter. We should do the essay injustice if we omitted to quote the following passage:—

'The objection will perhaps be urged in another form. It will be said that the other planets have so many points of resemblance with the Earth, that we must suppose their nature and purpose the same. They, like the Earth, revolve in circles round the Sun, rotate on their own axes, have several of them satellites, are opaque bodies, deriving light, and probably heat, from the Sun. To an external spectator of the solar system, they would not be distinguishable from the Earth. Such a spectator would never be tempted to guess that the Earth alone, of all these, neither the greatest nor the least, neither the one with the most satellites, nor the

Digitized by Google

fewest, neither the innermost nor the outermost of the planets, is the only one inhabited; or, at any rate, the only one inhabited by an intelligent population. And to this we reply, that the largest of the other planets, if we judge rightly, are *not* like the earth in one most essential respect—their density; and none of them, in having a surface consisting of land and water, except perhaps Mars; that if the supposed external spectator could see that this was so, he might see that the Earth was different from the rest; and he might be able to see the vaporous nature of the outer planets, so that he would no more dream of peopling them, than we do of peopling the grand alpine ridges and valleys which we see in the clouds of a summer sky.'

This, in fact, contains a tolerable sketch of the whole argument on either side. We can only say that to us, neither the facts assumed nor the conclusions involved in the reply, seem satisfactory, or are sufficient to destroy the force of the analogy. But in the following we entirely concur—for a plurality of worlds is no integral part of our 'creed,' whatever it may be of Sir David Brewster's; nor would its proved falsity disturb our entire acquiescence in the Creator's love and wisdom:—

'One such fertile result as the Earth, with all its hosts of plants and animals, and especially with man, an intelligent being, to stand at the head of those hosts, is a worthy and sufficient produce, so far as we can judge of the Creator's ways by analogy, of all the universal scheme.'

Most fully do we concur in the poet's language:—

'Behold this midnight splendour, worlds on worlds;
Ten thousand add and twice ten thousand more,
Then weigh the whole; one soul outweighs them all,
And calls the seeming vast magnificence
Of unintelligent creation, poor.'

But, on the other hand, if one world like ours be a sufficient theme for worship and admiring awe,—if we gladly acknowledge that we should be *content* to believe (if we could) that we alone inhabit creation; we must contend that the religious mind should feel no difficulty (such as our author urged) in an opposite doctrine. A plurality of worlds need not seem to us to diminish that personal regard and care which religion teaches us to recognise in God's providence.

'Thou art as much His care, as if beside
Nor man nor angel lived in heaven or earth;
Thus sunbeams pour alike their glorious tide
To light up worlds, or wake an insect's mirth;
They shine and shine with unexhausted store—
Thou art thy Saviour's darling—seek no more.'

We cannot refrain from quoting from the essay we have considered at so much length, a very forcible passage on the apparent waste of beauty in creation. In answer to the plea that the symmetry and beauty of the heavenly bodies argues

Digitized by Google

'that every part has been framed with a view to some use; 'that its symmetry and its beauty are the marks of some noble 'purpose,' our author alleges (among other things):—

'The diamond, the emerald, the topaz, have got each its peculiar kind of symmetry. Gold and other metals have, for the basis of their forms, the cube, but run from this into a vastly greater variety of regular solids than ever geometer dreamt of. Ice crystallizes by the same laws as other solid bodies; and our Arctic voyagers have sometimes relieved the weariness of their sojourn in those regions, by collecting some of the innumerable forms, resembling an endless collection of hexagonal flowers, sporting into different shapes, which are assumed by flakes of snow. . . . . And what are we to conceive to be the object and purpose of this? As we have said, that part of the purpose which is intelligible to us is, that we have here a force holding together the particles of bodies, so as to make them solid. But all these pretty shapes add nothing to their intelligible use. Why, then, are they there? They are there, it would seem, for their own sake; because they are pretty; symmetry and beauty are there on their own account; or because they are universal adjuncts of the general laws by which the Creator works. Or rather, we may say, combining different branches of our knowledge, that crystallization is the mark and accompaniment of chemical composition; and that, as chemical composition takes place according to definite numbers, so crystalline aggregation takes place according to definite forms. The symmetrical relations of space in crystals correspond to the simple relations of number in synthesis; and thus, because there is rule, there is regularity; and regularity assumes the form of beauty.'

The following, again, repays one for a perusal of a great mass of heavy writing:—

'Do we not, in innumerable cases, see beauties of colour and form, texture and lustre, which suggest to us irresistibly the belief that beauty and regular form are rules of the Creative Agency, even when they seem to us, looking at the creation for uses only, idle and wanton expenditure of beauty and regularity? To what purpose are the host of splendid circles which decorate the tail of the peacock, more beautiful, each of them, than Saturn with his rings? To what purpose the exquisite textures of microscopic objects, more curiously regular than anything which the telescope discloses? To what purpose the gorgeous colours of tropical birds and insects, that live and die where human eye never approaches to admire them? To what purpose the thousands of species of butterflies with the gay and varied embroidery of their microscopic plumage, of which one in millions, if seen at all, only draws the admiration of the wondering schoolboy? To what purpose the delicate and brilliant markings of shells, which live, generation after generation, in the sunless and sightless depths of the ocean? Do not all these examples, to which we might add countless others (for the world, so far as human eye has scanned it, is full of them), prove that beauty and regularity are universal features of the work of creation in all its parts, small and great; and that we judge in a way contrary to a vast range of analogy, which runs through the whole of the universe, when we infer that, because the objects which are presented to our contemplation are beautiful in aspect and regular in form, they must, in each case, be means for some special end, of those which we commonly fix upon as the main ends of the creation, the support and advantage of animals or of man?'

Digitized by Google

We had intended to bestow some notice on the second of the works which form the title of this article. We are limited, however, by our space, to a few very brief remarks. It will hardly be a misfortune to Sir David Brewster if his treatise should be passed without closer criticisms than we can afford to give. He takes up the cudgels against our essayist with a spirit worthy of better logic than he knows how to wield. The side he supports is the one which we would advocate; but we blush for the forced analogies, the unsound argument, the daring speculation, the inflated diction, by which it is supported. Sir David is a votary of the superseded school which denies the undulatory theory of light—perhaps he is one of its last representatives. He comes to any conflict of opinion on astronomical questions with a prejudice amounting almost to an *odium* against writers of the Fresnel school. And he retains the antiquated notion that every syllable of the Bible is not only *verbally—literally*—inspired, but was intended to teach men astronomy and general science, as well as godliness. He is one of those who 'cannot doubt that inspiration revealed' to his royal namesake 'the magnitude, the distance, and the final cause of the glorious spheres which fixed his admiration!' We are loth to speak with severity of blunders and prejudices which are based on a feeling of devout reverence for God's Word; but the knowledge of the age is beyond such senile notions as some which our northern philosopher advances, and he may rest assured that the devotion of which ignorance is the parent needs no lamentation over its fall. A man is far, very far, from doing God and God's book service, who maintains such an absurdity as that not only isolated texts, but the *English garb* of isolated texts (!) can be used as bases for scientific theory. It is not true reverence—but it may give the sceptic good reason to sneer—to quote S. Paul's words that by our Saviour 'the *worlds* (*αἰῶνες*) were framed,' in order to prove 'more worlds than one.' Such is little better than punning! It is Bibliolatry of the worst order—a slavish subserviency to the accidents of English. We cannot too much deprecate, as most injurious to the real interests of religion, such *mis*quotations as those from Isaiah, Amos, Genesis, and Job. Critics of a really large and wise judgment will not fasten on inspiration the forms of thought and expression in which Judaic cosmogony happened to model prophetic imagery. At all events, a sensible man will refrain from toying with the English version of most holy Scripture, and adducing Isaiah's poetry, or the idiom of Genesis, as bearing on the questions of astronomical conjecture or scientific probability. When a philosopher of the nineteenth century can utter such unphilosophical conceptions as the axiom that 'man *must* (in his

Digitized by Google

'future state) live upon a *material planet* (!) subject to *all* the 'laws of matter' (!!)—when he can hence evolve the proposition that 'there is not *room* on our globe' for this purpose, and that, therefore, he must have recourse to other systems for his *habitabit*, we feel indignantly disposed to ask him if he ever read the fifteenth chapter of S. Paul's first letter to Corinth; or rather to quote from it an exclamation addressed by the Apostle to a similar reasoner, 'Thou fool!' But, without so far giving way to our vexed astonishment, we will quietly commend such argumentation to the followers of Mr. G. S. Faber.[1]

We have complained, we think not without reason, of awkward style in the author of 'Of, &c.,' but the language of his opponent is miserable. It varies from the turgid bombast of pomposity, to the style of Lindley Murray's *un*corrected[2] exercises.

'Man as now constituted, could not have lived amid the storms, and earthquakes and eruptions of a world in the act of formation.'

Most true; but wherefore?

'The thunder of a boiling and tempest-driven ocean, as its waters rushed upon him at midnight, would . . . . have roused him from his couch!'

Sir David might really have expressed his discomforts more directly than by indicating the inconvenience of his Alarum!

Take the following as a specimen of English composition:—

'We shall not venture to ascertain how much more *of God's glory* is seen in the mere material structure of Saturn and his ring, and of Jupiter and his satellites, than *it* is (!) in the minutest insect that lives but for an hour.'

And, as suggestive of a new branch of logic:—

'The argument for a plurality of worlds may have two forms. It may embrace a new point of analogy between the inhabited earth and any of the planets, primary or secondary . . . . It may also have a second form, namely, that which is called a *reductio ad absurdum*, that is, an argument in which it is shown that the opposite opinion is an absurdity. The *strictest* truths in geometry have been considered as demonstrated by this species of argument; and it is still MORE applicable in the present case, where mathematical certainty CANNOT be reached, BECAUSE there may be different degrees of absurdity, and we may have an *argumentum ad absurdi*OREM (!), and an *argumentum ad absurdissimum*.'

This is truly the *ne plus ultra* of absurdity. Sir David says, truly enough, 'it is hardly necessary to illustrate these views by more familiar similitudes,' and then, after the manner of authors, proceeds to do it:—

'The Creator of a solar system, with but one of its smallest planets inha-

[1] The author of 'Many Mansions,' a work in which materialistic and spiritual conjectures are, in like manner, confounded and compounded together.

[2] All the following extracts are unaltered in the last edition.

Digitized by Google

bited, launched into an orbit of immeasurable circuit, and wheeling through ether with the velocity of fifty-seven miles in a second, may have some resemblance to a mighty autocrat, who should establish a railway round the coasts of Europe and Asia, and place upon it an enormous train of first-class carriages, impelled year after year by tremendous steam-power, while there was but a philosopher and a culprit in a humble van, attended by hundreds of unoccupied carriages and empty trucks!'

Here is a mystery. We are sorry that our efforts to divine the entire solution of this allegory have not been crowned with success; but the Emperor of Russia, the Master of a large College, and the Vice-President of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, would seem to be parties to the plot.

We take our leave of Sir David Brewster's work with a very acute feeling of disappointment. We are sorry to find so very famous a man condescend to employ rhodomontade and bad reasoning on so very interesting a theme. We are the more sorry, because we feel that *such* an answer to so able (though we trust we have shown not immaculate) a work as his opponent's, cannot but weaken the cause which we ourselves incline to support. To Sir David, an advocate of a plurality of worlds may well exclaim, 'Save me from my friends!' Would that the author of the Essay had been writing on the opposite side! We should gladly have hailed so able and ingenious a thinker as an advocate instead of an opponent of a plurality of worlds. His immense information, his enormous capacity, his store of able if not profound thought, would have made him an irresistible pleader on a better cause than he has chosen. With the ingenuity which, in his present work, he exhibits—δεινός τίς ἐστι θέσεις διαφυλάττειν—he could easily have made the *better* appear the better cause. Nor are we aware that his habits of thought, as previously exhibited, would in any wise have unfitted him for such an advocacy. One, who, if we mistake not, is not *entirely* dissimilar from him in his antecedents, ably argues:[1]—

'The earth, the globular body thus covered with life, is not the only globe in the universe. There are circling about our own sun six others, as far as we can judge, *perfectly analogous in their nature*, besides our moon and other bodies analogous to it. No one can resist the temptation to conjecture that these globes, some of them much larger than our own, are not dead and barren; that they are, like ours, occupied with organization, life, intelligence. To conjecture is all that we can do; yet even by the perception of such a possibility, our view of the kingdom of nature is enlarged and elevated.'

Yes, to conjecture is all we can do; and we shall perhaps

[1] Dr. Whewell, Bridgewater Treatise, p. 269.

Digitized by Google

never attain a nobler or more enviable spirit than that of the child's poem—for a Poem it is:—

'Twinkle, twinkle, little star,
How I wonder what you are!'

But if we cannot be content with grateful and admiring awe; if we must conjecture, let our conjectures be directed in the most natural, the most philosophical, the most religious course. We have scarcely done more than indicate in these pages *which* we conceive to be that tendency, but it is one which, to us at least, seems irresistible. We are at best children disporting themselves on the margin of truth's ocean, picking up here a pebble and there a shell, but ignorant of all that lies beyond. Yet it would be unwise to conclude that *our* shores and *our* shoals alone are tenanted with these beauteous creations, while the islands which appear to stud that ocean, and all its prodigious depths, are destitute of the activity that displays itself with us. We cannot forbear from quoting the beautiful and devout language of our own sweet psalmist:[1]—

'"More and more stars! and ever as I gaze
Brighter and brighter seen!
Whence came they, Father? trace me out their ways
Far in the deep serene."
My child, these eyes of mine but faintly show
One step on earth below:
And even our wisest may but dream, they say,
Of what is done on high, by yon empyreal ray.

* * * * *

But surely of yon lamps on high we deem
As of pure worlds, whereon the floods of mercy stream

Yea, in each keen heart-thrilling glance of theirs
Of other stars we read;
Stars out of sight, souls for whom love prepares
A portion and a meed
In the supernal Heavens for evermore,
When sun and moon are o'er;
Fixed in the deep of grace and song, as these
In the blue skies, and o'er the far-resounding seas.

* * * * *

More and more stars! behold yon hazy arch
Spanning the vault on high,
By planets traversed in majestic march,
Seeming to earth's dull eye
A vault of gleaming air: but take thou wing
Of faith, and upward spring:
Into a thousand stars the misty light
Will part; each star a world with its own day and night.

[1] *Lyra Innocentium.* The Starry Heavens.

Digitized by Google

Not otherwise of yonder Saintly host
Upon the glorious shore
Deem thou. He marks them all; not one is lost;
By name He counts them o'er.
Full many a soul, to man's dim praise unknown,
May on its glory-throne
As brightly shine, and prove as strong in prayer
As theirs whose separate beams shoot keenest through this air.'

Such is the poet's expansion of the ancient and most sure promise, when the patriarch, the father of the faithful, looked towards heaven and failed to number the stars, 'So shall thy seed be!' And this, we must confess, is a philosophy with which we would rather err, than be bereft of its noble and lofty imaginings, for the sake of fanciful speculations concerning the constitution of 'granulated nebulæ' and 'curdled lumps of light.' Let truth be paramount everywhere, and in all cases; let science demand our hearty assent to all she has to teach; but, while we are precluded from bringing positive science to bear on such a theme, while probability and balanced analogies are all our resource, we are loth to be robbed of such ideas as have animated and comforted the breasts of men like Bentley, Isaac Taylor, Chalmers, and Whewell, in past time. We have the fullest conviction that every advance made in physical knowledge will afford fresh matter for reverential and grateful thought. We do not, therefore, check the march of intellect, and the progress of certainty and truth. But, while speculation only can be applied to the subject, we cannot prevail upon ourselves to abandon the strong analogies which seem to tell us that there is a sweet harmony in the eternal heavens, in which the discords of our own life shall be finally resolved in such a pulse of symphony as man hath not heard nor in his heart conceived; that there is some centre of the universe whence the relations, and attributes, and mysteries of existence shall assume a glorious symmetry and proportion; that, for the moral and intellectual, not less than for the material scheme of things, we dare cherish no Ptolemaic theory;—that our earth is but a speck in God's wide, wide world.

Digitized by Google

ART. III.—1. *Ueber das Verhaltniss des Islams zum Evangelium. Von* DR. J. A. MÖHLER. *Ed.* DÖLLINGER. Regensburg. 1839.

2. *Essai sur l'Histoire des Arabes avant l'Islamisme, pendant l'Epoque de Mahomet, et jusqu'à la réduction de toutes les tribus sous la loi Musulmane. Par* A. P. CAUSSIN DE PERCEVAL, *Professeur d'Arabe au Collège de France, &c.* Tomes 3. Paris: Didot Frères. 1847-48.

3. *Mahomet et les Origines de l'Islamisme. Par* M. ERNEST RENAN. *Revue des deux Mondes.* Paris. 1851. Tome xii. p. 1063.

4. *Lettres sur la Turquie, ou Tableau Statistique de l'Empire Ottoman. Par* M. A. UBICINI. *Première Partie. Les Ottomans.* Deuxième Edition. Paris. 1853.

5. *Lives of Mahomet and his Successors.* By WASHINGTON IRVING. New York and London. 1850.

6. *History of Arabia and its People.* By ANDREW CHRICHTON, LL.D. New Edition. London and Edinburgh: Nelson and Sons.

7. *Lectures on the History of the Turks in its Relation to Christianity.* By the Author of Loss and Gain. Dublin. 1854.

IF, gazing upon the shelves of a well-stocked modern library, we should observe a large and increasing proportion of volumes, which, more or less directly, bore reference to the person and the creed of Mahomet; and if, further, we were informed that their general tendency was more favourable to the Arabian teacher than were, for the most part, those of an earlier age; the first and most obvious mode of accounting for this circumstance would be the existence of the War in the East. Nor indeed would it be difficult to point out many volumes, for whose tone and for whose very appearance our new armed alliance would sufficiently account. But this solution would before long find its limit. After glancing at the contents of numberless books of travel, and of biographical and historical sketches, professing to throw light upon the all-absorbing topic of the day, we should arrive by a retrograde course at rows of volumes upon the same theme, prior in point of time to the outbreak, or even the expectation, of the present war, yet often partaking of the same lenient tone in all that respects Mahomet

Digitized by Google

and Mahometanism.[1] It was long before the Anglo-French support of Turkey that Mr. Carlyle exclaimed, that Mahomet's creed 'was a kind of Christianity—I should say a better kind 'than that of those miserable Syrian sects, with their vain jang-'lings about'[2]—we rather shrink from finishing the sentence, since the words are those of the Nicene Creed and the Arian heresy respectively, concerning the nature of Him who is the object of Christian worship. It was in the days of European peace, that Sir Charles Fellowes, ignoring, if we mistake not, all reminiscences of the Seven Churches in Asia Minor, produced the account of his travels, as a panegyrist of the Mahometan conqueror, Mahmood, and his people. The ponderous tomes of Mahomet's latest German biographer, Weil,[3] were published some three or four years since. Of the works given at the head of this article, one only (that of Dr. Newman) can, we believe, be said to have been originally prompted by the stirring events occurring round us.

We must seek, then, some more adequate solution. The causes of these phenomena are probably manifold and varied: enough for us to indicate a few.

The mere appearance of fresh works upon Islamism and its founder may have originated, partly in the love of book-making, partly from the discoveries made by honest, student-like research. The book-making tribe is ever on the look out for a hero who is not worn threadbare, a theme which is not yet exhausted; and certain of its members seem to have become aware (even before the powerful impulse since imparted to their labours) that such a theme and such a hero were yet to be found in the past history and present condition of Arabia and Asia Minor, Turkey and Hindostan. On the other hand, the truly learned Orientalist, the critical and philosophic investigator, has alighted upon manuscripts hitherto undeciphered in the West, or detected

[1] Lest any purist should be shocked *in limine* at our employment of the popular corruption, *Mahomet*, we beg to observe with M. Caussin (for the remark applies to Englishmen quite as well as Frenchmen)—'*cette altération du mot Mohammed est consacrée parmi nous.*' The same might be asserted of the term *Mahometanism*, as applied to his creed. The reader who dislikes either form may mentally substitute another. In the latter case, there is abundant choice. He may adopt the German word *Islam*, or the French *Islamisme;* may, with Mr. Hallam and others, speak of *Mohammedism;* with Dean Prideaux and others, of *Mahometism*. The last two coinages are, we presume, as lawful as that of Irvingism and the like names.

[2] Heroes and Hero-Worship, Lect. ii. p. 98. We trust that neither Mr. Monckton Milnes, nor Mr. Kingsley, in endorsing this lecture with the mark of their approbation, intended to include this sentence. There are, as will be seen, some positions in the lecture of Mr. Carlyle which we are very far from controverting. On the other hand, there are some which Mr. C. all but controverts himself, and half unsays where he is speaking of *the hero as poet*. Pp. 175, 176.

[3] *Mohammed der Prophet, sein Leben und seine Lehre.* Stuttgart, 1843.

Digitized by Google

what appear to him mistakes in the ordinary estimate of Mahometanism by Europeans; and out of the fulness of his knowledge and strength of his convictions, imparted to us, as became him, the fruits of his study and meditations.

Thus much for the mere existence of this class of books. The greater tenderness displayed towards Mahomet is a distinct and somewhat more complicate affair. We are not ignorant that in venturing to assert it as a fact, we are speaking with some degree of vagueness and generality. Among the studious writers of the present century may be found those who have dealt severely with the creed of Islam. Our travellers, too, have, in many instances, been unsparing in their criticisms upon Turkish character and manners. And so, again, among authors of an earlier generation there are partisans, as they may be fairly termed, of Mahomet. The most learned English translator of the Koran, Sale, is pronounced, even by Gibbon, no harsh judge, to be half a Mahometan; and a French biographer, the Comte de Boulainvilliers, seems to have composed his untrustworthy *Vie de Mahomet*, as an attack, and hardly a covert one, upon Christianity.[1]

Nevertheless, if the least favourable of our list of books be compared with the earlier comments of Prideaux,[2] Maracci,[3] White,[4] the compilers of the Universal History, or even of Professor Smyth,[5] it will be allowed, we think, that the balance is in Mahomet's favour. Such modification of views, be it greater or less, as has really taken place, will be probably found to have arisen from an admixture of causes, some most honourable and generous, some very treacherous and malignant. If, for instance, any deeper research into the original sources of history, or calmer meditation upon facts already known, has led to discoveries which lessen the burden of charges against Mahomet, what lover of truth will hesitate to accept such results with cheerfulness? If, again, the changed circumstances of the Ottoman Empire—once keeping all Europe at bay, now reduced

[1] Boulainvilliers, who died A. D. 1722, is said to have ended his days as a Christian. He seems to have asserted that this, and other sceptical productions of his pen, were written in aid of religious truth from a conviction that Divine Providence would raise up defenders of sound doctrine. (Art. Boulainvilliers, *Nouvelle Biographie Universelle*. Paris, 1853.) It would be equally easy to believe that the Czar intended the present war as a boon to Turkey, and under the conviction that powerful supporters of her cause would be vouchsafed to her.

[2] Life of Mahomet, by Humphrey Prideaux, D.D., Dean of Norwich. London, A.D. 1708. (Fourth Edit.)

[3] Maracci, Professor of Arabic at Rome, published his Latin translation of the Koran, with the *Prodromus* and *Refutatio Alcorani*, at Padua, in A.D. 1698. It is said to have been the result of forty years' labour. (See Chrichton, p. 227.)

[4] Professor White's Bampton Lectures were preached at Oxford, A.D. 1784.

[5] Lectures on Modern History, vol. i. lect. iii.

Digitized by Google

to beg Christian support against her powerful antagonist of the North—throw a different hue over the aspect, not merely of her present condition, but even of her past history, who will deny but that such alteration in the mental vision of men, arises from a noble sentiment, which may occasionally need to be checked and moderated, but seldom or never to be repressed? We too often behold, on the part of men in power and authority, a reversal of that grand old Roman rule:—

Parcere subjectis et debellare superbos.

Let us rejoice at any proofs that it still abides in the hearts of Englishmen, for it is one which used to be deeply enshrined in their better nature, and has frequently shone forth amidst the fermentation caused by great events. Let any one, to take a modern example, look at the judgments passed by our countrymen upon Napoleon, at the time when he stood forth as the conqueror at Austerlitz or Wagram, and Napoleon as the exile of Saint Helena; it will hardly seem that the same person is being spoken of. Moreover, in such cases, there is apt to be a reaction, inasmuch as it is probable that enmity and alarm have unduly exaggerated the faults of a foe. And thus, too, the somewhat excessive anti-Mahometan zeal of a Prideaux, a Maracci, and in later times a Frederick Schlegel, was of itself calculated to provoke a counter-demonstration of feeling from tolerably unbiassed by-standers.

And here we would gladly close our list of causes for the phenomena in question. We wish that we could think that such motives had in all cases been the leading ones. But there is that about some writings of the day which forbids us so to think; suspicions of the existence of a very different element from those above-named will occasionally force themselves upon the mind, and it were no true charity to conceal them. We fear that, in some cases, the panegyrists of Islamism are, with more or less consciousness of purpose, again trying to employ it as a weapon against Christianity, or, at any rate, in support of the worst species of latitudinarianism. They fancy, and possibly not without reason, that infidelity has not yet availed itself to the utmost of the specious arguments deducible from the origin and progress of the Arabian religion; that it may yet be made to perplex the evidence for the divinity of the Christian faith just in the point where Christianity appeared most strong, namely, its extension and adaptation to the different races of mankind; and that thus, if Mahometanism can no longer hope to subdue Christendom by force of arms, it may yet become an intellectual cause of its decay and ultimate overthrow.

Digitized by Google

Vain hope! vain as ever the expectation of the Mussulman forces on the eve of their meeting with Charles Martel at Poitiers, or Don John of Austria at Lepanto, or Sobieski under the walls of Vienna! He who hath promised to His Church that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her, can, whensoever it pleases Him, raise up champions in the arena of discussion as bold, as true, as victorious as those who erst contended for His kingdom upon earth with sword and spear, and jeoparded their lives unto the death. Vain hope! yet not, therefore, to be contemned and disregarded by such as desire the glory of God and the highest welfare of their brethren. For even as the power of the Crescent, though doomed to wane and fade before the Cross, has yet been proved a source of sore trial and perplexity, and caused torrents of human blood to flow: so too the reasoners on its behalf, though never fated to enjoy any real and lasting triumph, may yet win for a season some mental realm of Spain, some moral Constantinople, and help to injure, if not slay, the souls of many, as their prototypes maimed and destroyed their bodies. We seem to detect some traces of such mischief even in quarters where deliberate hostility to revelation was certainly not intended by the writer.[1]

These considerations are, of course, open to controversy. As, however, we cannot afford to dwell upon them, for the present, at any greater length, they must be left to the judgment of the reader; but, whatever be the reason, it is at least plain matter of fact, that the theme of Mahometanism has received much illustration since the time of Gibbon. Those who, like that distinguished historian, 'must profess their total ignorance of the Oriental tongues,' may not only enjoy the advantage of

[1] The following illustration of our meaning is one of the *least* offensive that we could select. A living biographer, speaking of the commencement of Mahomet's career, remarks: 'The *good old* Christian writers, on treating of the advent of one whom *they* denounce as the Arab enemy of the Church, make superstitious record of divers prodigies which occurred about this time, awful forerunners of the troubles about to agitate the world. In Constantinople, at that time the seat of Christian empire, were several monstrous births and prodigious apparitions, which struck dismay into the hearts of all beholders.' [The italics are ours.] Some details are given; as moving crosses, hideous figures rising from the Nile; the sun diminished in appearance, and shedding pale and baleful rays; furnace-light on a moonless night, and bloody lances glittering in the sky. Now, we do not pretend to have examined the evidence for the appearance of these prodigies, and are quite ready to admit, that very possibly it might not bear a searching examination. But, for his own sake, and the sake of others whom he may influence, a Christian writer should be careful how he indulges in anything like sneers at assertions so closely resembling the promises made by our Lord with reference to events of which Mahomet's coming may be fairly considered partly typical. (S. Matt. xxiv. 11, 21—24, 29.) As for the words, 'whom *they* denounce,' &c., they are almost ridiculous. Mahomet's hostility to the Church (whatever be thought of his degree of consciousness or guilt in the matter) is *a simple historic fact*, quite independent of any one's denunciation, or any one's denial.

Digitized by Google

referring to the works which he consulted, and to the graphic pages of his own narrative, but may likewise have recourse to many valuable and important publications which add greatly to our stock of knowledge upon the subject. The field of inquiry has been surveyed from points of view the most remote, and even opposite, and there now exists an ample collection of essays and treatises, biographies and histories, in which Mahometanism is successively portrayed as it appeared to spectators who have gazed upon it with the glance of a philosopher, a sceptic, a latitudinarian, an ultra-Protestant, or a Roman Catholic divine.

Et nos ergo manum; we too have looked, in our humble way, at questions so intimately connected with some of the deepest problems which can occupy the human mind, some of the most weighty events which can affect the fortunes of the human race. We too have attempted to weigh in the balance the lucubrations of some authors of learning and of genius; and to form opinions upon Mahomet, and the antecedents of his country before his birth, upon the nature of his creed and its relation to Paganism and to Christianity.

Crude and undigested as our notions may probably prove, they may yet be not ill-founded in the main; they may present from the works of the distinguished authors before us some aspects of the case which will be new to a portion of our readers, and suggest to the happy few, who can extract gold as it were from sand, far more perhaps than was thought of by the writer. But before commencing our self-imposed task, it will naturally be expected that we render some account of our authorities. This reasonable expectation we proceed at once (briefly, but not, we trust, presumptuously) to gratify.

The essay of Möhler, so well-known as the author of the 'Symbolik,' was originally published in a review. Since his death it has been reprinted, in company with other minor writings of its author, by Dr. Döllinger, and it may be easily procured in this form at a very reasonable price. It is now some years since our Quarterly Reviewers called attention to its merits, and expressed a desire that it should be translated. The hint has not been lost: in the catalogue of books recommended to their students by the authorities at S. Augustine's College, Canterbury, appears a translation of this essay by an English Clergyman, the Rev. J. P. Menge, of the Church Mission, Guruckpore. This version, however, we have not had an opportunity of procuring.

It is indeed a dignified and masterly paper, full of information, still fuller of thought. Truly Catholic in its tone, it would have delighted the honoured founder of those annual

Digitized by Google

London lectures,* which are directed to be launched 'against notorious unbelievers, not descending lower to any controversies that are among Christians themselves.' In accordance with his title, Möhler has taken into consideration, 1. the external, 2. the internal, 'Relation of Islamism to the Gospel;' adding thereto a third part, upon the probable future of Mahometanism. Admirable as is the discussion of the main problems considered in the treatise, this third part must, we fear, be pronounced to be somewhat unduly sanguine in its expectations.

The interest which Möhler felt in these questions was aroused, if not created, by the events of 1829. And here, *en passant*, we would beg the thoughtful student, who would fain estimate at its just worth the excessive eulogy at present lavished on the Turks, to cast his eye backward for one instant on the history of the formation of the Greek kingdom. Let him compare, if possible, the language of the English press, or at least of a large portion of it, at that epoch, with the tone adopted by it now. If those fervid denunciations of Turkish cruelty and oppression are, for the moment, forgotten or explained away, it is no hazardous prophecy to foretel, that a day will surely come, when these far less merited praises will be likewise buried in oblivion, or if remembered, remembered only with regret.

The second work upon our list, which sets forth the results of the researches of M. Caussin de Perceval, Professor of Arabic, at Paris, is beyond doubt one of the most important contributions to a right understanding of the historic part of the question which has for some years issued from the press. M. Caussin has made diligent and judicious use of some hitherto unexplored manuscripts preserved in the noble library of the French capital; more especially of one by the Arabian author, Ibn Khaldoun. The arrangement of his materials is good; his style admirably transparent; and if, at times, the scantiness of information reduces his narrative to little more than a bare catalogue of names, the consequent aridity must in fairness be ascribed to a conscientious desire of imparting to us the whole of the discoveries he has made. Even those portions which are most in danger of appearing tedious, are frequently relieved by the point of some Arab proverb, or the sparkle of their native poetry. The critical parts of the work display much judgment and good sense; whatever can be won from the field of Holy Writ is gleaned with care and reverence. In his endeavours to extract some grains of truth from ancient Arabian legends, M. Caussin seems to us to follow in the wake of Niebuhr. His

[1] The Boyle Lectures, founded by the Hon. Robert Boyle, A.D. 1691.

Digitized by Google

subject, however, gives him one advantage over the historian of Rome. Niebuhr had to deal with stories which most of us had been brought up from childhood to believe implicitly. His scepticism (against which there now seems to be some degree of reaction) was a great shock to all the classically educated. Wordsworth expressed the general sentiment:—

> 'Those old credulities, to nature dear,
> Shall they no longer bloom upon the stock
> Of history, stript naked as a rock
> 'Mid a dry desert? What is it we hear?
> The glory of infant Rome must disappear,
> Her morning splendours vanish, and their place
> Know them no more.'

But, in the case of Arab legends, there is no such early partiality and implicit credence to be encountered: in many instances the tale investigated will prove new to the great majority of readers; and even those which may be previously known, are generally such as we are glad to find capable of yielding so much as a hint of truth and fact to the inquirer. And here again, M. Caussin reminds us of one of the best features of Niebuhr's great work, inasmuch as he might fairly adopt that historian's words, and say that he has written 'on the principle 'of asserting nothing, however slight, with any other than the 'precise shade of conviction which it has in his own mind.'[1]

The paper of M. Renan in the *Revue des deux Mondes* is not unworthy of that most ably conducted periodical. We are not sure that we can thoroughly, and in all respects, approve its tone; but it certainly seems to display a large amount of industry and acuteness. M. Renan has earned the right of criticising Orientalists, from having long made such subjects his especial study.

Two of the qualities which we have praised in M. Caussin, good arrangement and clearness of expression, may be almost said to be national excellences of French authors. They are again exhibited, though in a different way, in M. Ubicini's 'Letters upon Turkey.' This seems to be recognised by very high authorities as being at present *the* book upon all that relates to the statistics of that country.

The 'History of Arabia' by Dr. Chrichton, although not to be classed for originality or importance with the writings of Möhler, Caussin or Ubicini, yet contains much compressed information, and deserves praise for the evident care and candour with which it is composed. These qualities induce us to select it from among the many similar productions of the day.

We cannot give Mr. Washington Irving's book a very high

[1] Niebuhr, Hist. of Rome, vol. ii. p. 286. (Eng. Tr.)

Digitized by Google

place among the efforts of his pen. The story is (with some slight exceptions) written in a good spirit and pleasantly told; but we agree with M. Renan in thinking that there is no great exhibition of critical power on the part of the biographer.

It remains to say a few words upon the Lectures, by the author of 'Loss and Gain.' That the lecturer should thus designate himself would naturally lead the reader to expect a controversial treatment of the subject, and such a treatment he will indeed discover throughout a considerable portion of the work. One leading idea, perhaps *the* leading idea, intended to be impressed upon the minds of the hearers, was the energy, perseverance, and virtual success of the Roman See in resisting the progress of the Crescent. To an audience of co-religionists, the task of proving this point must have been as easy as it was grateful. Nor, we imagine, will the candid Protestant of any school, who is well versed in history, deny to the Popes of Rome the just praise of their far-sightedness and noble zeal in such a cause; nor complain that a Roman Catholic writer should remind us on this head of much that we might be disposed to forget. It may be true, that if the voice of the Church of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries had been listened to by warriors and statesmen, 'there would have been no Turks in Europe for the Russians to turn out of it.' It is lamentable to reflect that the internal wars and jealousies of Christian states prevented such an effort to resist their entry being made. But the entire case seems to us, we must own, to be presented by Dr. Newman in a partisan-like way, which makes the ordinary reader who is not of the same communion somewhat suspicious and distrustful of his guide. Thus, for instance, it *looks* as if the historical sketch came to an end with the battle of Lepanto, in A.D. 1571, rather than with the victory of John Sobieski nearly a century later, because a Pope was more immediately concerned with the naval triumph than that gained by the Polish king before Vienna. Of the Popes who reigned just before the Reformation, he speaks as follows:—'As to the 'Pontiffs who filled the Holy See during that period, I will say 'no more than this, that it did not please the good Providence of 'God to raise up for His Church such heroic men as S. Leo of 'the fifth, and S. Gregory of the eleventh century.' Now, this is language which may possibly be excused, we suppose, in a zealous Roman Catholic, who shrinks from proclaiming the sins of a Pope, as any of us, in private life, might naturally hold back from publishing the errors of a parent. For ourselves, we should consider the employment of such terms a step towards depravation of the moral sense, towards obliterating the broad distinction between right and wrong, virtue and iniquity. Would

Digitized by Google

not total silence have been preferable to such extraordinary euphemisms? An Alexander VI. and a Leo X. not quite fit for the calendar, something short of being saints! And, further, though we have no desire to extenuate the faults of rulers, civil or ecclesiastical, in Constantinople and the regions round about before its fall in the middle of the fifteenth century, yet the student of history who shall peruse these Lectures will do well to bear in mind, that there is a Greek, as well as a Latin, account of the transactions of that memorable era; and that the two should be diligently compared by him who would form a correct judgment upon the entire case. A single instance may suffice for illustration.

Among the kingdoms which were attacked by the conquering Ottomans at the period of which we speak, was that of Bosnia. Its rude mountains, and the strong castles which crowned their summits, fitted the country to become a very rampart of Western Christendom. The Bosnians, however, were accused, and we fear not unjustly, of being tainted with Manichean heresy. Being a somewhat ignorant and barbarous race, they do not seem to have possessed very distinct and settled convictions; and, under a sense of alarm at the impending danger, they sought to form alliance with the Christians of the West. Their king, Stephen Thomas, in A. D. 1445, actually conformed to the Church of Rome. But as he declined to punish those among his subjects who retained their opinions, the Latins remained doubtful of his orthodoxy, and regarded the misfortunes which fell upon his country as a direct chastisement from Heaven. In the year 1462 (*i.e.* nine years after Constantinople had fallen), Stephen, son and successor of this Stephen Thomas, addressed Pope Pius II. upon the same subject. The Turks had been treating the Bosnian peasants with such favour as to win a majority to their side; unless the Venetians, the Pope, or some of the Latin people lent assistance, the country would pass, without a blow, to the foes of Christendom. Bosnia would in that case prove a safe harbour to the Turks, whence they might, in their turn, oppress Italy or Germany. At present, a few good troops would be enough to restore courage, and induce all the warlike Bosnians to imperil their lives for the defence of their country, and remove the scourge of the barbarians from Christendom. But if Bosnia were suffered to fall, the most powerful armies would hardly avail to keep the Turks out of Italy and Germany. In conclusion, Stephen reminded the Pope that his father had announced to Nicolas V. the coming capture of Constantinople early enough for a few thousand Latin soldiers to have saved it—the letter, remarks the historian, still exists, and is full of just and generous sentiments—and entreated

Digitized by Google

Pius II. not to permit the Latins to fall a second time into the same mistake.

Pope Pius II. refused the wished-for aid; Bosnia fell; the predictions of King Stephen proved but too correct. Our authority for this narrative is Sismondi, in his *Histoire des Républiques Italiennes;*[1] and if that great historian be as extreme in one direction as any Papal writer can be in the opposite; if his reflections are but too frequently prompted (as one of his compatriots once remarked to us) *par la haine des rois, et la haine des prêtres;* yet his honesty has throughout prevented him from anything like misstatement of facts. Moreover, we are writing with the Italian translation before us, a version by Signor L. Toccagni, published but a few years since at Milan.[2] In this version the editors have added notes to such portions of Sismondi's work as appeared unfair to the Roman Church; but the portion referred to in the present instance has no such note. Whatever inferences may be fairly drawn from it (and the narrative tells against the Bosnians as well as the Italians), we leave to the judgment of our readers, simply observing that the very existence of such facts is but barely alluded to in Dr. Newman's Lectures.[3]

But having freely pointed out what we consider blemishes in this volume, we may be permitted to speak with equal freedom of its manifold beauties and attractions. Although bearing some slight marks of haste, and of being got up for the occasion, although at times almost *over*-charged with facts, this little production will impart to most readers a far clearer and more connected view of Turkish history than can be derived from many books of far greater pretensions. Despite its partisanship (nay, perhaps in consequence of it, for it is open and avowed) it may be safely read, we should imagine, by any one. And in its skilful use of very varied and diverse materials, in its harmonious reconciliation of apparently conflicting statements, in its fine discrimination, in the magic of its style,—now pausing in philosophic thoughtfulness, now hurrying onward with a vigorous flow of narrative, and breaking forth at moments into bursts of eloquence,—in its winning apostrophes, in its fulness alike of denunciation and of praise, some, at least, will recognise once more the workings of those marvellous gifts of head and heart, which erst held them as if spell-bound and enthralled, imparted to them fresh views of life, taught them much con-

[1] Chap. lxxix.

[2] Milano, Borroni e Scotti, 1851.

[3] The advice and exhortations of Pope Pius II. to the heroic Scanderbeg (A.D. 1463) *to break a solemn treaty which had been most rigidly observed by the Turkish Sultan*, were as imprudent as they were morally indefensible. Scanderbeg had great scruples, but at length, to his cost, gave way.—*Sismondi*, chap. lxxix.

Digitized by Google

cerning themselves, much concerning the world around them, still more concerning the world unseen,—knowledge that cannot perish, thoughts that must abide with them their whole life long, lessons, of whose teacher they cannot but think, when, with good Bishop Andrewes, they thank their Maker for all who have benefitted them by their writings.

The works thus enumerated will be our principal, though not our sole, sources of information. We would fain employ them as the Roman philosopher professes to have used the writings of the Stoics: 'Sequimur, . . . non ut interpretes, sed . . . è fontibus eorum, judicio arbitrioque nostro, quantum quoque modo videbitur, hauriemus.'[1]

Among the characteristics of the nation and of the land where Mahometanism first arose, there are some which exercised no inconsiderable influence upon the reception and promulgation of that creed. Of these it will be well to make some mention.

And firstly, if for freedom of thought there be needed a long previous training of civil and social freedom, it may safely be asserted that in few countries could there have existed a safer asylum than in Arabia. Protected upon one side by deserts, which few foreign enemies would venture to traverse; seldom spoken of by the Egyptians, who desired to keep all Indian as well as African commerce in their own hands, it was little known to either Greeks or Romans: and although the fame of the fertility and wealth of at least one district (that of Yemen) had given the country at large some celebrity as early as the time of Herodotus,[2] it was reserved for the Macedonian conqueror to conceive the idea of subduing it, and making it a seat of empire. That design, however, Alexander did not live to realize; nor do we find any account of a conquest of Arabia before the Christian era. About a century after Christ, the all-absorbing influence of Rome had indeed cast its shadow upon the land, and medals were being struck by Trajan in honour of this addition to the empire. But the vaunted conquest only extended to a province; so that of this and of other later foreign dominations Gibbon is obliged to admit that they have been only temporary or local; that the body of the nation has escaped the yoke of the most powerful monarchies; that neither Sesostris nor Cyrus, Pompey nor Trajan, had ever really become its master.

The Arab is considered by good judges to be a fine specimen of the human race, both in his physical and intellectual development.[3] Certainly no mere advantages of country could have

[1] Cicero, de Officiis, lib. i. cap. ii. § 6.
[2] Herod. iii. 107.
[3] Chateaubriand, cited with approval by Dr. Pritchard (Researches into Physical

Digitized by Google

availed to keep a people free, under the attacks of so many and powerful foes, without much courage and spirit on their own part. Great energy and strength of will seem conspicuous among them; and the strong attachment between those of the same tribe produced, as of old among the Highland clans of our own kingdom, much pure and generous sentiment, despite its tendency to the same grave faults of character. They have ever been respectful to their elders, and liberal in their hospitality; and their exceeding good faith towards one another is noticed by the father of history.[1]

Some of the tribes lived in tents, some in towns and cities. Although there seem to be instances of an alternation between predatory and mercantile pursuits on the part of some, yet commerce was naturally more flourishing among the inhabitants of the towns. Nor was merchandise considered in any way dishonourable: the noblest warriors united trade with the profession of arms. Indeed, the very name of the distinguished tribe (the Koreish, or, as French writers give it, Coraychites) from which Mahomet sprung, is thought to signify men of commerce.[2] And although the Koreish themselves may not have been descended from Ishmael, yet in both these features of character we may trace the influence of the tribes which owned that parentage. For while, on the one hand, this progenitor was to be a 'a wild man, his hand against every man, and every man's hand against his,' yet we know that, in the third or fourth generation, the Ishmeelites were willing, as merchantmen, to purchase 'an Hebrew for a slave,' as they journeyed from Gilead to Egypt, 'with their camels bearing spicery, and balm, and myrrh.'[3]

The descent of a large portion of the Arabian tribes from Ishmael, although for very obvious reasons the subject of some sneers on the part of Gibbon, does not appear to have been in any degree shaken, but on the contrary confirmed, by more recent research.[4] The remaining tribes, with a few comparatively unimportant exceptions, claimed descent from Kahtan, the son of Eber,—the Joktan of our version of the Bible,[5] the Yectan of the modern French writer. These last claimed to be

---

History of Mankind). See Art. *Arabia* in Dr. Smith's 'New Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography.'

[1] Σέβονται δὲ Ἀράβιοι πίστις ἀνθρώπων δμοῖα τοῖσι μάλιστα. (Supply σεβομένοις in this construction, says Matthiæ, 'Greek Grammar,' § 290.) Herod. iii. 8.

[2] Caussin (tom. i. pp. 229, 230) thinks this a very probable derivation of the word.

[3] Genesis xvi. 12; xxxvii. 25—28.

[4] Mr. Forster, in his 'Mahometanism Unveiled,' is considered to have established this point, even by those who (like ourselves) are not prepared to accept his theories.

[5] Genesis x. 25—29.

Digitized by Google

the oldest and purest race, the 'Arab-el-Araba,' or Arabs of the Arabs, a phrase which has naturally been compared with St. Paul's expression, 'an Hebrew of the Hebrews.' They and their probable descendants, the Koreish, occupied the north of the country: the Ishmeelites and their descendants (the Himyarites, the *Homeritæ* of classic authors) held the south. Among the exceptions alluded to, seem to have been some of the descendants of Abraham by Keturah, and, subsequently, certain of the children of Esau. It is true that Herodotus,[1] and it appears also, Ibn-Khaldoun, agree with some ancient traditions in placing certain Cushite and Canaanite tribes in these regions: but these children of Ham disappeared; the Canaanites went to Syria and there became famous under the title of Phœnicians; the Cushites concentrated themselves in Ethiopia. Any remnants of these Hamite tribes were engulfed by the dominant children of Shem; and thus, *from a very early period, Arabia has been inhabited by a purely Semitic race.*[2]

This circumstance will not appear unimportant to those who consider how largely it has pleased the Almighty to make the sons of Shem depositaries of spiritual truth. It had been suspected by Mr. Hallam,[3] from the tone of the romance of *Antár* (supposed to be pre-Mahometan), that however much idolatry might prevail in some parts of Arabia, still the genuine religion of the descendants of Ishmael was a belief in the unity of God as strict as the Koran itself can teach. This suspicion, which had been stated by other writers also, may now be considered as an established truth. To M. Caussin de Perceval belongs the credit of having done the most towards its confirmation.[4] Nevertheless, it will be seen, as we proceed, how seriously, before the rise of Mahomet, the monotheistic creed had been sullied and impaired.

We know, from the vivid portraitures of Sir Walter Scott, how the principle of clanship, which gives rise to so much that is striking and devoted in human nature, has likewise its less favourable side; of this unfavourable aspect the Arab displays his full share. 'Their own writers,' observes Sale, 'acknowledge 'that they have a natural disposition to war, bloodshed, cruelty 'and rapine; being so much addicted to malice, that they scarce 'ever forget an old grudge.'[5] The same writer mentions an amusing theory of some physicians, to the effect, that this

[1] Herod. i. 1. Φοίνικας .... ἀπὸ τῆς Ἐρυθρῆς καλεομένης θαλάσσης. See, however, the note of Bähr upon this passage. The Red Sea *may* be meant to include the Persian Gulf.
[2] Caussin, tom. i. p. 5.
[3] Hist. of Middle Ages, vol. ii. chap. 6. (2d Note.)
[4] Cf. M. Renan, p. 1089.
[5] Preliminary Discourse, sect. i.

Digitized by Google

vindictive spirit is engendered by the frequent use of camel's flesh as food; the camel being an animal most revengeful and tenacious of its anger: but the genuine Arab would hardly, we suspect, care to invent this, or any other palliation, for what he believed a blameless feeling. Other nations have at least had *sayings* on the duty of forgiveness,[1] if they have not attained to the *practice* of that virtue, which, even in Christians, is one of the highest and latest fruits of heaven-sent grace; but the Arabian is unblushing on this score.

Perhaps in estimating the intensity of clannish rivalry and vengeance among this people, we ought to take into account the circumstance, that the Arabs, beyond all other nomadic tribes, have vividly expressed *the whole of what they felt.* Other people may have harboured sentiments in their breast, and waited till an opportunity arose to express them *in action;* but the dwellers in Arabia, from an early age, have prided themselves on the gift of language, and been passionately fond of poetry. Indeed they go so far as to imagine that their own is the only tongue possessing a grammar, and that all other dialects are but rude *patois.* One of their countrymen, who has travelled in France, the Sheik Rifaa, has been at great pains to remove this prejudice, and inform his brethren that the French language likewise has its own rules and elegances, and an academy to regulate them.[2] But, however much this ludicrous self-sufficiency betrays the spirit of a barbaric race, untaught by civilization even to approximate to a just estimate of the gifts of any nation beyond themselves, yet the critiques of Oriental scholars seem to justify the Arabs in not thinking meanly of the capacities and refinements of their tongue. Translated into the languages of the West, it must, of course, suffer an almost unappreciable amount of injury. 'In every 'language,' says Southey, 'there is a magic of words as un-'translatable as the *Sesame* of the Arabian tale,—you may 'retain the meaning, but if the words be changed the spell is 'lost. The magic has its effect only upon those to whom the 'language is as familiar as their mother tongue; hardly, indeed, 'upon any but those to whom it is really such.'[3] Hence, certainly, one great cause of the apparent poverty, to an European ear, of much that delighted and thrilled the hearts of the Asiatic hearers to whom it was first addressed.

[1] Mr. Trench (Hulsean Lectures, p. 155) alludes to a beautiful collection of Indian sayings of this kind. It must be owned that they do not exist in Greek or Roman writers; at least, we can only call to mind the fine exceptions in Juvenal and Homer, Il. ix. 492, *et seq.* The great speech of Demosthenes is not a real exception. He praises public and national pardons, which, after all, were in great part suggested by motives of policy.

[2] M. Renan.

[3] Quart. Rev. xxvii. 38, cit. ap. Hallam. Lit. of Europe, vol. ii. p. 287.

Digitized by Google

F. Schlegel, in his very able summary of the characteristics of the dwellers in Arabia, remarks: 'Those tribe-feelings, and 'passions of pride and hatred, anger and revenge, so prevalent 'among the Arabians, are displayed in their ancient poetry, and 'even constitute its essential spirit and purpose.'[1] Here, as in some other respects, this distinguished writer is perhaps *paullò iniquior* to the countrymen of Mahomet. Their loves, their liberality, their hospitality, their pride in their steeds, their fondness for poetry itself, at least claim a due share of the ancient Arab poems, as well as their love of pillage and their thirst for vengeance. But it is not to be denied, that this last-named passion, so dear to the natural man, is frequently expressed with great vigour and gusto on the part of the minstrel. A specimen may perhaps interest the reader. In a battle between Arabs of Irak against the Ghassanide Arabs of Syria, Aswad (king of Hira, from A.D. 471 to 491) overcame the Ghassanides, and took captive many of their princes. Aswad's own inclination was to accept a ransom and restore his prisoners. But a cousin of the king, by name Abou-Odheyna, who had lost a brother in the conflict, urged, only too successfully, a more sanguinary course of proceeding, in the following very celebrated verses:—

'Man does not obtain what he desires every day; and jealous fortune will not permit him to enjoy a success at his leisure.

'When we are in possession of opportunity, wisdom commands that we should not let it escape us.

'It is just to compel our enemies to drink of the cup whose bitterness they have made us taste,

'To slay them with the sword with which they first struck us.

'Mercy towards the weak is a virtue, towards the strong it is madness. Any contrary maxim is false.

'Thou hast killed one brother in battle, and thou wouldest leave the others alive! It would be drawing certain peril on thy head.

'Do not let go the serpent, after having cut his tail; if thou art wise, crush his head.

'They have bared the sabre, let them feel its edge; they have kindled the fire, let them become its food.

'What will be said if thou sparest them?—that it is not generosity on thy part, but a fear of consequences.

'For they are princes, the pride of the family of Ghassan; a powerful family, whose ambition naturally desires thy kingdom.

'They offer us a ransom; they boast of their horses and milch camels, whose beauty charms all beholders.

'What? For our blood, which they have shed, they offer us milk in exchange? Of a surety the bargain would be glorious for us!

'No, no! No ransom. Remember thou, that from us, in such a case, they would accept neither gold nor silver!'[2]

[1] Philosophy of History, Lecture xii. *ad init.*

[2] Caussin, tom. ii. p. 65. They have also been given, with a Latin translation, says M. Caussin, by Schultens (*Monumenta veterum Arabum*, p. 57), and by M. Fleischer (*Histoire anteislamite*, p. 124).

Digitized by Google

In this instance the poet was stimulated by the desire of producing a practical result. This, indeed, was regarded by the Arabs as one great end both of poetry and eloquence;—a man who had thus persuaded his tribe to anything great, or dissuaded them from a dangerous enterprise, was thenceforth honoured with the title of *Khateb*, or orator. Among those who did not write poetry themselves, it was esteemed an accomplishment and mark of good birth to have been so educated as to quote with ease and aptness upon all occasions.[1] Another great aim of their poetry was to preserve, as in an historical record, the distinction of descents, the rights of tribes, and the memory of great achievements: hence a poet was deemed an honour to his tribe; other tribes congratulated the fortunate one on their possession; and at entertainments given in honour of the bard, the women wore their nuptial garments;—only the birth of a son, and of a foal of generous breed, were celebrated with an equal degree of rejoicing. Once every year was a meeting held of all the tribes, at which poets contended for a prize. Their prize-poems are known as the *Moallacat.*[2] Comparatively few have come down to us, as the use of writing was more rare before the age of Mahomet, or, as the Arabs would say, *in the time of ignorance.* We select a few examples from the curious researches of M. Caussin. It need hardly be said, that the reader must not look for the logical sequence of the classic authors of Greece and Rome. The fulness of the periods, the elegance of the expression, and the allusive acuteness of the proverbial sayings, (frequently bearing reference to historic legends,) have been, from the days even of the inspired Solomon, the attractions of Eastern composition;—their verses are, indeed, as 'Orient pearls at random strung.'

Here is an extract from a prize-poem by Imroulcays, the founder of their laws of metre. It displays an observation of nature and enjoyment of its beauties which is but rarely exhibited in the pagan classics of the West:—

'My friend, seest thou those lightnings, which move like rapid hands, and flash above those mountains of clouds which they crown?

'They throw a light brighter than the lamps of the solitary, whose hand has lavished on the twisted wick, the oil expressed from the sesame.

'I stop to watch them; my companions also stop with me, between Dhâridj and Odbrayb. At what an immense distance lay the picture that attracted my attention!

'The storm, as far as my eye could discern it, extended on the right to Mount Catan, and on the left to the mountains of Setan and Yadhbal.

---

[1] Sale, Prelim. Discourse, sect. i.

[2] That is, *Poems suspended;* for they were hung to the walls of the Caaba, the great temple of all Arabians, at Mecca. (Caussin; Sale.)

Digitized by Google

'It shed on Coutayfa, torrents that overthrew the highest trees.

'It sent on the summit of Kenân a shower which drove the roes from their coverts.

'At Taymâ, the tempest has not left standing a palm-tree, nor a house; only citadels, made of enormous blocks of stones, have withstood its violence.

'Mount Thabîr, in the midst of clouds that dissolved into rain, looked like a venerable old man enveloped in a striped mantle.

'In the morning the summit of Moudjaymir, full of the tracks of the torrents, looked like the clew of flax on a distaff.

'The storm in sending its waters on to the plain of Ghâbih, has renewed its verdure, and made blossoms burst forth; so the merchant of Yemen, when he makes a halt, opens his bales, and displays a thousand varied stuffs.

'The birds of the valley are twittering with joy, as if they were intoxicated since the dawn with a delicious and piquant wine.

'The lions, which the torrents have carried off and drowned during the night, lie extended in the distance, along with feeble and weak plants uprooted on the ground.'[1]

So important a feature in the poetic character was this love of nature considered, that life in towns was esteemed unfavourable to the development of the bard's genius, because the townsman could not have the beauties of natural scenery continually before his eyes. But we hasten to afford proofs of the existence of some of the other themes of Arabian verse to which we have alluded. Hâtim, one of the noblest ante-Islamite chieftains of the tribe of Benóu Taij, on numberless occasions thoroughly acted up to the spirit of his generous professions. These words were addressed to his bride, Mâwia, a lady of such exalted rank as to entitle her to divorce her husband whenever she pleased. The latter part was written after she had exercised this privilege towards Hâtim himself.

'Riches, oh, Mâwia, come in the morning, and depart at evening. They are transitory, but they can procure for man immortal renown.

'Oh, Mâwia, in whatever state I am, never do I say to the man who begs of me, I have nothing to give thee.

'Oh, Mâwia, when my owl (my soul) shall fly into the desert, and my body, laid in the tomb, shall taste no more either water or wine,

'Shall I feel myself robbed of what I have given? Should I enjoy that which I had denied?

'The world may know that Hâtim might be rich, if he wished. But I devote to benevolence all that I acquire; and I nourish others, to live in their memory.

'I have known both riches and poverty; I have tasted the two cups of fortune.

'Riches did not puff me up with pride, neither does poverty humiliate me.

* * * * * * * * *

'Others are slaves to their wealth; I, thanks be to God, dispose as I will of my own goods.

'I employ it in redeeming captives, in feeding travellers, in shedding benefits around me; and I do not imitate the miser, who mingles reproaches with the little that he bestows.

[1] Caussin, tom. ii. pp. 331, 332.

Digitized by Google

'It is thus that men are divided into two classes; grovelling spirits delight in parsimony; great souls delight in the glory of generosity.'[1]

We can only afford space for one more such extract. Zohayr (reckoned with Imroulcays and Nâbigha as the three greatest poets of the time of ignorance) laments, at the age of eighty, the wife of his youth, whom he had rashly divorced; and subsequently appeals to chieftains of another tribe to keep inviolate a treaty of peace.

'Are these the traces of the sojourn of Oumm-Aufa, these mute remains of an encampment on the stony soil of Darrâdj and Motethallem?

'Has Oumm-Aufa occupied, between the two Racma, this abode, whose vestiges are like prints newly touched on the flesh of the arm?

'There wander by turns, troops of white gazelles, and herds of wild cows, with large eyes; their little ones, leaving their hiding places, bound along beside their mothers.

'I am again in these places, which I have not beheld for twenty years. Scarcely do I recognise them. At last my doubts vanish.

'These stones, blackened by the fire, served to support the kettles; this circular bowl-like trench not yet degraded, surrounded the tent of Oumm-Aufa.

'Yes, I remember this place; and I exclaim, Abode of my beloved, may this dawn bring thee a happy day, may Heaven preserve thee!

* * * * * * * *

'My friend, send these counsels to the Dhobyân and their allies; say to them, Are you not bound by the strongest oaths to observe peace?

'Do not attempt to conceal from God your secret thoughts; God knows all that is hidden.

'If sometimes he delays his vengeance, he writes it in the book of his decrees, and reserves it till the day when he will demand an account from each one of his actions; often also he punishes crime by a sudden chastisement.

'You know the evils of discord; you have felt them by bitter experience, and it is not on doubtful reports of them that you have formed your opinion.

'If you rekindle war, you will bring ignominy on yourselves; war, like a wild beast, will attack you furiously if you rouse it; as a fire, will it burn you; as a mill bruises the grain, will it crush you; as a camel which brings forth twins every year, will it be fertile to you in evils.'[2]

One circumstance revealed in these poems is the excessive amount of gambling, of drunkenness, and consequent quarrelling, prevalent among the pre-Islamite Arabs. Of the other positive qualities of their poetry we have already spoken. But it is time to remark upon one negative feature—we mean the total absence of anything like religious mysticism. If, in a later day, a mystic philosophy arose in the Arabian peninsula, that philosophy may be traced to Persia for its origin.[3] But Arabia had neither mysticisms nor mythology; between the Creator and the created universe there existed too profound a gulf to be bridged over by

[1] Caussin, tom. ii. pp. 614, 626. [2] Idem, pp. 531, 532. [3] M. Renan.

Digitized by Google

the lines of connexion imagined by the Hindoo or the Greek. The incarnations of a Buddha, the anthropomorphic visions of a Jove or Pallas, a Mars or a Diana, would have been in early time simply repulsive to the Arabian understanding. The very notion of a *goddess* would have shocked them hardly less than it would have shocked a sincere Hebrew. The idea is perhaps essentially *anti-Semitic*. The Greek and Roman worshippers of goddesses were sons of Japhet; and, if the idolatrous king of Judah 'went after Ashtoreth, the goddess of the Zidonians;'[1] if degenerate Jews could 'burn incense unto the queen of heaven;'[2] in both instances these sinful practices were learnt from children of the race of Ham.

Nevertheless, that deep pervading consciousness of sinfulness, impurity, and consequent unfitness for immediate access to an all-holy and glorious God, which is so frequently found to dwell even in the heart of unregenerate man, will naturally lead the worshipper to seek for something which may stand between himself and his invisible, eternal Maker. To the Christian this want is supplied by the sublime verity of the Incarnation, and its ordained accompaniment, a sacramental religion. For the Jew there was the hope of the promised Messiah, and meanwhile the presence of that Law, which was 'ordained by angels in the hand *of a mediator*'—the prophet 'whom the Lord knew face to face,' and who pleaded for Israel on Mount Sinai.[3] The pantheistic creeds, Buddhist or Braminical, which have prevailed so extensively, not only in the East, but likewise in pagan, and, alas! even in Christian, Europe, have their own way of evading, if not of fairly meeting, the difficulty. But where neither pantheism, nor Judaism, nor Christianity prevailed, there seemed to remain for the sinner, who would fain approach his Maker and yet shrunk from direct appeal, the refuge of idolatry alone.

At the time of Mahomet's appearance, Arabia possessed votaries of nearly all these creeds. Just as, in matters of state, some tribes were under Roman domination, some under that of Persia, some alternating between the rule of the two sceptres, and some, if nominally subject, yet practically free; even so was the inward life of the nation disunited and distracted between various forms of faith. Judaism prevailed extensively in Yemen; Christianity in Irak, Syria, and parts of the desert between Palestine and Egypt; but the majority, and more especially the entire race of Modhar, were buried in the darkness of paganism.

---

[1] 1 Kings xi. 5. [2] Jeremiah xliv. 16—19. [3] Gal. iii. 19; Deut. xxxiv. 10.

Digitized by Google

Judaism had been introduced into Yemen (the *Arabia Felix* of geographers) by Abou-Carib, a *Tobba*, or king, of the Himyarites, about A.D. 235. Tradition said that the ministers of the false gods, with their idols, and some Jewish doctors, with their sacred books, had been compelled to enter a particular fire, which was believed by the inhabitants of the district to possess great powers of discrimination, and regularly appealed to in all trials of importance. The Jews, with their books upon their breasts, came out safe and unhurt; their rivals and the idols were utterly consumed.[1] Nevertheless, Judaism did not make any considerable progress until the commencement of the sixth century, when a king called Dhou-Nowâs propagated it with great zeal. This zeal led him to become a persecutor of Christianity; and his shameful treatment of the Christians of the district of Nadjrân was probably the main cause of the ruin of the Himyarite monarchy.[2]

Christianity, notwithstanding some local and temporary triumphs, seems never to have taken thorough root in the soil of Arabia. S. Pantænus is believed, on apparently good authority, to have preached the Gospel there towards the close of the second century, and to have discovered traces of S. Bartholomew:[3] but the converts make but little show in history. One Himyarite prince, Abd-Kelâl, who reigned from A.D. 273 to 297, (about the time of S. Pantænus,) was beyond doubt a Christian. And what was the result of his conversion? He did not dare to avow it openly; but his subjects, finding that he had renounced their worship, rose against him, slew him, and the Syrian missionary who had been his enlightener.[4] Another sovereign of the same dynasty, Marthan (A.D. 330—350), has likewise been claimed for a Christian, but in reality only, it would seem, because he exhibited in his kingdom the rare spectacle of universal toleration, being wont to say, 'I reign over bodies, not opinions. I require of my subjects that they obey my government; as for their doctrines, it is for God their Creator to judge them.'[5] This king was a wise ruler, generous and powerful; but it may be questioned whether such notions as his are often preludes to the acceptance of Christianity. A few churches were, indeed, built in his reign, through the influence of the Roman Emperor in the East, Constantius, but Christians remained few and isolated. Their neighbours the Abyssinians were Christians, and avenged the murderous persecutions of Dhou-Nowâs. The noble race of Ghassan were in

[1] Caussin, tom. i. p. 95.
[2] Idem, tom. i. pp. 128, 129.
[3] Eusebius says (Hist. Eccles. v. 10), that he reached India.
[4] Caussin. [5] Idem.

Digitized by Google

part converted, probably about the date of the edicts of Constantine in favour of Christianity in the fourth century; and at a much later date (about A.D. 600) a tribe called the Taghlibites, in Mesopotamia. It is worthy of observation that S. Simeon Stylites (about A.D. 410) made considerable impression upon them. We need hardly add, what is painfully well known, that the Arab independence of thought displayed itself even among the Christians in an acceptance of nearly every form of heresy. There might be found in the peninsula, Arians, Eutychians, Nestorians, and Ebionites; partisans of Beryllus, the Collyridians, and the Nazareans.[1]

The form of idolatry most in vogue was that known as the Sabian, which at the time of Cyrus divided the world with the Magian, or worship of fire.[2] Their idols, though in theory admitted to be intercessors only with Allah, received in reality far more of homage and attention. The sun and moon were adored by some, certain of the planets by others; some made prayers to Sirius, some to that fine star which even in Europe is best known by its Arab name of Aldebaran.[3] Some of their superstitions were dark and cruel. Those who believed in a future life would often slay a camel on the tomb of a relation or friend, or, far worse, fasten it and let it die of hunger, that it might be ready to be ridden by the deceased on the day of judgment. They thought, too, that the soul flitted over the grave in the form of an owl (a belief alluded to in one of the poems we have cited); and that if the person had been murdered the bird cried '*Escourri*' (*i.e.* give me drink), and ceased not till the blood of the murderer had been shed. But the most revolting and inhuman of their customs was one that obtained in some quarters of burying alive a female infant immediately it was born. This most wicked and unnatural practice arose sometimes from the reluctance to share nourishment with one who could not aid in the fight and foray, sometimes from a fierce and excessive pride, lest they should ever chance to endure the shame of seeing a daughter carried off and dishonoured by their enemies. Belief in genii and ghouls, (so well known to us as pervading the more recent scenery of the immortal 'Thousand and One Nights,') was likewise very widely extended. And although the Arabs would have probably shrunk, (as has been intimated,) even in their worst days, from imagining a goddess so nearly on a level with Jupiter as Juno, yet the angels

[1] The authorities are given by Sale, sect. ii.

[2] Prideaux's Connexion, &c., part i. book iii.

[3] This star, which is of great importance in navigation, forms the eye of Taurus near the Pleiades. A line through Orion's belt *upwards* almost touches it, just as the downward line from the same belt leads to Sirius.

Digitized by Google

whom they worshipped were considered to be feminine, and called *Benat-Allah*, or daughters of God.[1]

The Arab women frequently display, in scenes of history, great devotedness and affection as mothers, but very seldom as wives. The reason is obvious; polygamy being unrestricted, and divorce at will on the part of the husband, and (in case of very noble birth) on the side of the wife also, a woman might well regard her son as her own, but how could she venture to call her husband so? She possessed, so to speak, but a share of him at best, and the duration even of that share was never certain and assured. Moreover, before the rise of Mahometanism, a widow was considered as a part of the heritage of her deceased husband; and thence arose unions between sons-in-law and mothers-in-law, which were afterwards justly stigmatized as odious.[2] No wonder that a sort of vague syncretism was the creed of many: Jewish and Christian ideas insinuated themselves in some degree even into the minds of pagans. The famous temple, common to all the tribes, at Mecca, the Caaba,[3] had become a kind of Pantheon; and, strange to say, among the images of idols, there was a Byzantine figure of the Madonna, holding the Divine Infant in her arms.[4]

Such were the leading characteristics of that nation, whose boast it was that God had bestowed upon them four great and peculiar privileges: that their turbans should be their diadems; their tents their homes; their swords their entrenchments; and their poems their laws.[5] If a philosophic observer, like Thucydides, had cast his glance upon them, he might possibly have conjectured, (as that historian almost prophetically said of the Scythians,)[6] that if once at unity among themselves, they would be most difficult to resist. Unity was in store for both. The Scythians attained it under the sway of those great and terrible conquerors, Attila, Zingis, and Timour; the Arabians under the teaching and rule of Mahomet.

Some years before the preaching of Mahomet, there appeared

---

[1] Caussin. [2] Idem.

[3] We do not dwell upon the Caaba, because it has so often been described. A picture (from an old MS. in the Bodleian Library at Oxford) is given by Ockley, in his 'History of the Saracens,' and a similar one by Sale. It was certainly a very ancient building: and the statue of Abraham is supposed, with reason, to indicate an Ishmaelite origin. The Koreish, as is well known, had enjoyed the custody of this temple for many years before the birth of Mahomet. Cossay, the first of that tribe who obtained it, rebuilt the temple about A. D. 450. (Caussin, Sale, Ockley, Irving, &c.) In the centre was the famous black stone, given to Ishmael by the angel Gabriel. It was originally white; but became black, either from the effects of fire, or as other authors maintained, from the sins of those who touched it. (Caussin, Chrichton, &c. &c.)

[4] Renan, Caussin. [5] Sale. [6] Thucyd. ii. 97.

Digitized by Google

among the idolatrous natives of Arabia, certain signs of distrust and dissatisfaction with the state of religion. At a great meeting of the tribe of the Koreish, four men, who seem to have been in advance of their countrymen, held a secret meeting, and imparted to each other their sentiments. 'Our fellow-country-'men,' said they, 'are in a wrong path, they are far astray from 'the religion of Abraham. What is this pretended divinity to 'which they immolate victims, and around which they make 'solemn processions? A dumb and senseless block of stone, in-'capable of good or evil. It is all a mistake: seek we the 'truth, seek we the pure religion of our father Abraham? To 'find it, let us quit our country, if need be, and traverse foreign 'lands.'

The four who thus spake were Waraca, son of Naufal; Othman, son of Houwayrith; Obaydallah, son of Djahch; and Zayd, son of Amr. How deep-seated was their sense of a religious void, how sincere their craving after truth, how earnest their search after its hidden treasures, may be gathered from the fact, that three out of the four (namely, Waraca, Othman, and Obaydallah) became converts to the faith of Christ: Waraca and Othman without any intermediate state of transition; Obaydallah, after having lived long enough to try, but without satisfaction of his heart's needs, the creed of the Arabian seer.[1]

Whether there was anything in the inmost soul of Zayd which made it less fit for the reception of divine truth than those of his companions, the Judge of all men can alone decide. He was certainly less favoured in external circumstances. His comrades received the Faith, more or less directly, from the teaching of strangers; but the relatives of Zayd, offended at his evident estrangement from pagan superstitions, would not suffer him to travel, and consult the wise of other lands. Detained at Mecca, Zayd went day by day to the Caaba, and prayed the Almighty to enlighten him. He might be seen leaning his back against the wall of the temple, deep in meditation, which constantly issued in the following prayer: 'Lord! if I knew in what way thou 'didst will to be adored and served, I would obey thy will; but 'I know it not.' And he would fall prostrate, with his face upon the earth.

Though not permitted to attain the full knowledge of what was true and right, Zayd could at least denounce much that was false and wrong. He adored the Divine Unity, publicly attacked

[1] Caussin, tom. i. p. 321, et alibi. Waraca had, however, entertained the idea that an Arabian prophet was at hand, and so spoke to his cousin Kadijah as rather to confirm her belief in her husband, Mahomet. (Caussin, tom. i. p. 356.) But this may possibly have taken place before his conversion—which, by the way, M. Renan (p. 1090) omits altogether—unless Waraca regarded Mahomet as an ultimate apostle of Christianity.

Digitized by Google

the false gods, and declaimed energetically against various superstitions. Among others he forbade men to eat the flesh of victims offered to idols, (a most remarkable injunction,) and strove to inspire his countrymen with a just detestation of their shocking practice of destroying their infant daughters. Imprisoned by an uncle, he contrived to escape, wandered from place to place, heard at length, (strange to say, from a learned Christian monk,) that an Arab prophet had arisen, who was preaching the religion of Abraham at Mecca. This was Mahomet. Zayd hastened back to hear him, but was robbed and murdered on the road. He may fairly be regarded as a kind of precursor of Mahomet himself. His very existence, however, says M. Caussin de Perceval, has been hitherto almost unnoticed by European *savans.*

We have dwelt at great, we fear at unreasonable and disproportionate, length upon these points of Arab character and pre-Mahometan history; partly, because they are probably but little known, even to many well-informed persons; partly, because they must necessarily exercise no inconsiderable influence upon our judgment of Mahomet and his work. But although we propose to offer, as has been stated, some remarks upon these last-named subjects, yet it forms no portion of our plan to give a sketch of the Arabian teacher's life. On this head, the reader may refresh his memory by referring to the famous fiftieth chapter of Gibbon, or may learn something of the more recent researches of Dr. Weil, by purchasing at a railway station the pages of Mr. Washington Irving.

His noble birth, of the family of the Hashemites, of the tribe of the Koreish: his journeys, as a mercantile traveller, for the wealthy widow, Kadijah, who in course of time offered him her hand, and thus made him independent: his love of solitude and meditation in the lonely valleys around Mecca: the commencement of his preaching in the forty-first year of his age: the ridicule and persecution at first entailed upon him: his scanty band of early proselytes, made even slenderer by his account of his famous journey by night to heaven: his flight from Mecca, the victory at Beder and defeat at Ohod: his failure to win the Jews, and consequent hostility towards them: his assassination (through the hand of others) of his enemies, Khalid, Cab, and other leading Jews: his breach of his own laws concerning matrimony, and subsequent revelations to justify his conduct: his embassies to sovereign princes, the letters sealed with a signet MOHAMMED - APOSTLE - OF - GOD, within six years after the era of the Hegira (the well-known flight of A.D. 622): his discussions with Christians: his re-instalment of the vague old lunary

Digitized by Google

calendar of Arabia: his contests with rival prophets, El-Aswad, Moseilama, Toulayha: his illness and death,—these are matters of history, which we shall, if necessary, assume and reason upon, without going into further details, excepting where they are wanted for an ulterior end, or illustrate what has already been advanced.

It is necessary, however, to premise that the sources of information for the life of Mahomet are of a twofold character, one appertaining to the Persian or Turkish histories, the other to that of the Arabian biographers. The Arabian alone are trustworthy, the Turkish and Persian accounts being full of legendary matter. In Pindaric language, we must seek from Mahomet's fellow-countrymen the ἀλαθῆ λόγον, while from Turkey and Persia spring the δεδαιδαλμένοι ψεύδεσι ποικίλοις . . . . . μῦθοι. This distinction, however, in the relative value of authorities does not appear, in general, to have received from European writers the degree of attention which it deserves. Even Dr. Weil, in the opinion of M. Renan, has not been sufficiently alive to its importance. But those who would fain study deeply the subject of Mahometanism and its founder, should certainly be on their guard in this respect.

Before proceeding to more serious questions, we may venture to exhibit one proof of the manner in which the tribe-rivalry, which has been alluded to, at first operated to the disadvantage of Mahomet. At an early period of his career as teacher, an order was issued by the Koreish, forbidding men, at their peril, to listen to him. When, therefore, he prayed in the porch of the Caaba, and recited aloud a chapter of the Koran, he found himself immediately deserted. Curiosity, however, proved too strong. Certain chiefs, who were among the authors of the prohibition, were the first to break their own regulations. Three, named respectively Aboudjahl, Abou-Sofyan, and Akhnas, went near his house one night to listen to his prayers: none knew of his comrade's intentions, and great was their mutual astonishment, as they came forth, each man from his hiding-place. The sequel shall be given from M. Caussin:—

'They mutually reproached each other for their curiosity, and promised not to yield to it again: nevertheless, the two nights following, the same scene took place. They then bound themselves by an oath not again to expose themselves to the temptation, and to maintain a profound silence on the affair.

'Akhnas had been touched. He wished to know what impression had been made on his companions. He went to Abou-Sofyan and said, "Father of Hanzhala, what thinkest thou of what thou hast heard?" —"I understood some things," replied Abou-Sofyan; "I found others above my comprehension." Akhnas went on to the abode of Aboudjahl, and put the same query to him. Aboudjahl replied, with some vexation,

Digitized by Google

"Hitherto we have been competitors for fame with the children of Abdmanâf on equal terms: they fed the poor, we feed them too; they paid the forfeits of others, we paid them also; they gave largesses, we gave them as well; our families were like race-horses, galloping side by side. And now we are to allow that they have amongst them a prophet inspired by heaven! No! never will we believe in Mahomet!" '[1]

To turn, however, to deeper problems. A writer who undertakes to treat of the subject of Mahometanism is expected to enunciate some opinion upon the character of Mahomet himself, and likewise upon the causes of his very marvellous and permanent success. With the latter problem we shall hardly attempt to grapple, although it may possibly receive some slight elucidation from the general views which will be set forth. But of Mahomet's character, so far as regards the question of his being a thoroughly self-conscious impostor, or the reverse, we must venture to speak plainly, and give reasons for the conclusions we have formed.

Be it avowed, then, that we think it impossible for any calm and candid investigator of the subject, as it appears amidst the lights cast upon it by the researches of this present century, to regard Mahomet *as a mere impostor*. A false prophet he was, if it be the mark of a false prophet to preach falsehood as well as truth, and to claim (whether from delusion or imposture) a mission which is not from the Most High. A shadow of Antichrist he must, we fear, in some sense be termed, if that last great enemy of the Church is to win his temporary power through the abounding of heresy among Christians, and is to claim that position among mankind which is due only to the Son of Man.[2] But by a mere impostor we understand such pretended Messiahs as the Jews have again and again accepted (which claimant, alas! except the true one, ever failed to find some acceptance with them?); such a teacher, for example, as that pseudo-Moses in Crete, who said that he had come again from heaven to lead them through the sea once more, and was followed by numbers, to their destruction;[3] such a deluder as, in fiction, is set before us in Moore's 'Veiled Prophet'—a picture, perhaps, hardly overdrawn; such a juggler of real history as Moseilama, supporting his pretensions by the display of an egg in a narrow-necked

[1] Caussin, tom. i. pp. 383, 384.

[2] It is right, however, to remark, that Mahometan Doctors esteem it an article of faith that Christ will return and conquer Antichrist, concerning whom they have a great deal to tell. See Möhler, p. 359. He cites an Arab poem, of which a verse is Latinized as follows: 'At Jesus certè reveniet aliquando contra Antichristum miserum astutumque, quem tunc perdet.' The consistency of this and other Mahometan teachings (as, *e. g.*, the truth of the miraculous conception) concerning our Lord, with His assumed inferiority to Mahomet, it is not easy to understand. Antichrist, under the name of Degial, is alluded to in 'Sinbad the Sailor.'

[3] Socrates, Hist. Eccles. vii. 38.

Digitized by Google

bottle,—a chemical trick, with which an Arab author, Tarikh-el-Khamicy, has shown himself perfectly acquainted;[1] such leaders as those half-ascetics, half charlatans, who have founded a kind of religious orders in Algeria. Such a one as these, Mahomet, we believe, was not; however much his sincerity may have been dimmed and tarnished on particular occasions, more especially amidst the complications of his later years.

In adopting this conclusion, we are well aware that we are running counter to the judgment of many whom we respect, and shall seem to be throwing our lot with the partisans of latitudinarianism and unbelief. Look, it will be urged, at the great names arrayed against such an opinion of Mahomet; take into account the admixture of Judaism and Christianity with Islamism; think of the fruits of this religion as displayed in its long, bitter, and enduring hostility to the Cross; consider the stains of voluptuousness and revenge which disfigure the character of the son of Abdallah; remember the convenient nature of those revelations, which were brought out at the exact juncture when they were needed to justify particular (and those very questionable) acts. Well, we have tried to ponder these objections, and allow to each of them their due weight. And, firstly, as regards the authority of great names, we cannot allow them to be decisive in a question of this nature. Unless proved to rest upon a sound basis, their judgments can but serve to remind us of the Aristotle-suggested saying, *Amicus Plato, magis amica veritas.* And while it ever must remain most true, that the hatred of evil is concomitant with the love of goodness, upspringing with its birth and growing with its growth, and that we are bound not to employ euphemistic terms concerning that which is wrong, nor put light for darkness, nor sweet for bitter; yet, assuredly, if in our denunciations we overstep the bounds of equity and truth, the truth will be most fearfully avenged. Undue re-action, as has been already intimated, has perhaps been thus brought about respecting Mahomet. Known to the earlier middle age under the names of *Maphomet, Baphomet, Bafum,* (whence the French words *bafumerie* and *momerie,* our English *mawmetry* and *mummery,*)[2] as a false god to whom human sacrifices were offered;[3] hardly understood, it would seem, in Western Christendom before the twelfth century, to be a pseudo-prophet only, and not a pretended divinity; regarded by Bibliander, Hottinger and Maracci, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, *only* in the light of an antagonist to Christianity—

[1] Caussin, tom. iii. p. 310.
[2] M. Renan. Cf. Trench, On the Study of Words.
[3] Renan.

Digitized by Google

a most true, but certainly imperfect and one-sided aspect of the founder of Islamism—it can hardly be deemed a marvel, that later generations should have to witness a kind of turn in the tide of feeling. And let not those, who may be inclined to look only upon the darker side of the character and creed of the Arabian, imagine that in so doing they are of necessity allying themselves with the wise and good alone, in opposition to men of questionable character. The case does not stand thus. On the one hand, those who would impute to Mahomet a very large amount of conscious imposture, may find much to support their views in the sentiments of the sceptical Gibbon: those who would picture him as a monster of cruelty and injustice, will find the portrait already drawn to hand by the *crayon* of the infidel Voltaire. For Mahomet, however much he fell short of a high standard of religious faith and practice, yet displayed a great deal too much of both to please the unbelieving Frenchman. Voltaire accordingly, besides contemptuous notices in prose, has represented Mahomet (in a tragedy, of which he is the chief character) in the blackest tints. The play, though extolled by La Harpe as a *chef-d'œuvre,* is justly, we believe, represented to be as contradictory to the facts of history, as it is to all correct views of Arabian customs. But then Voltaire has admitted that he was unsupported by facts, and has betrayed the secret of his enmity to the memory of Mahomet, by maintaining that such a representation is *virtually* true, on the ground '*que celui qui fait la guerre à sa patrie au nom de Dieu, est capable de tout.*'[1] While, on the other hand, those who, with us, are unable to see in Mahomet a mere pretender, may range themselves under the banner of one, whom both friends and opponents will recognise as one of the noblest examples of sanctified intellect which this century has seen,—the calm, the candid, the truly Christian, Möhler. Those who have studied the essay of Möhler will hardly, we suspect, lay much stress upon the second point adduced against belief in Mahomet's original sincerity, the admixture, namely, which his creed presents, of tenets and usages from the other religions existent in Arabia before his time. Is it really conceivable, we would rather ask, that he *could* have framed a system which should be quite independent of the influence of those around? And if, again, the prolonged and savage hostility of the Crescent to the Cross prove that Mahometanism combined, in its essence, a great lie with a most solemn truth; if Satan contrived, with consummate craft, to turn its weaknesses and falsities, thus mingled with eternal verities, into an instrument of evil which no unmitigated

[1] Dr. Chrichton, p. 222 (note).

Digitized by Google

error could have proved; nay, even if there was that within Mahomet's own heart which contained the germ of all this mischief,—it would still remain to be proved, that he was either an insincere or an hopelessly wicked man. Not necessarily insincere, because in error: for thus should we impute insincerity to all those who, in killing apostles, thought that they did God service; or even to that ardent Pharisee, who, before his conversion, raged furiously against the infant Church. Not necessarily bad: excepting in so far as the adoption of erroneous belief betrays some yielding to one of the three forms of temptation by which man is assailed,—the whisperings of that subtler spirit who, when Belial or Mammon have done their best and worst, comes forward with the allurements to singularity in creed, and spiritual pride, and domination over the spirits of our fellow-men. It is to this third, this most exalted and therefore most fatal, enchantment that all great heresiarchs have fallen a prey; yet they need not therefore, in the commencement of their career, have yielded to the two former lusts of sensuality or gold and temporal rule; need not have been immoral, nor covetous, nor tyrannical, nor even hypocrites. Pelagianism has been, in many respects, a far more unmixed source of evil than Mahometanism: but did the great antagonist of Pelagian heresy pursue its author with invectives only? On the contrary, S. Augustine treats with respects both the abilities and the character of Pelagius; calling him 'most acute;' 'circumspect;' 'one who is, as those who know him declare, good and to be extolled;' 'of chaste life and praiseworthy morals;' 'a man who is eminently Christian.'[1] Between Mahomet and Pelagius there cannot be any proper comparison: whatever were the faults of the former, he had not been, like Pelagius, brought up as one of the children of Christ's flock. Mahomet's revengefulness of temper does not seem to have been greater, if it were not less, than that of the average specimen of an Arab; neither do the annals of his early years present any feature which is morally reprehensible. But the remaining objection, that Mahomet produced fresh chapters of the Koran to justify his own acts, is certainly more serious, and needs some fuller consideration.

The circumstances were as follows:—Zayd, son of Haritha (not to be confounded with the Zayd already named, who was son of Amr), had been adopted as a son by Mahomet. The

[1] 'Vir acutissimus . . . . . circumspectus . . . . . istum, sicut eum qui noverunt loquuntur, bonum ac prædicandum virum . . . . . ipsi qui contra hæc disputant, cùm sint castâ vitâ, moribusque laudabiles . . . . . vir ille tam egregiè Christianus.'—S. Aug. De Peccat. Meritis et Remissione (tom. x. p. 73 C; p. 54 B; p. 74 B. Ed. Ben.)

Digitized by Google

prophet himself had given one of his cousins to Zayd in marriage, a lady who united much elegance of mind to great personal beauty,—Zeynab, the daughter of Djahch. On a visit to Zayd's house, Mahomet was deeply struck with the charms of Zeynab, and uttered words of admiration, which were probably involuntary. But Zayd, being informed of this, insisted on resigning his wife to one from whom he had received great benefits; and Zeynab certainly appears to have displayed no reluctance to make the exchange. Murmurs, however, were heard from some, it being contrary to Arabian usage, that any man should take the wife of an adopted son, however formally she might have been divorced. These murmurs were disregarded: the marriage was celebrated with greater magnificence than any of his former nuptials; and in the Koran (chap. xxxiii.) came forth a general permission to the Mussulmans to marry henceforth the divorced wives of adopted sons. The other occasion of this kind is far more lowering to his character. In March A.D. 630, his Coptic slave, Maria, gave birth to a son. In joy of the event—for he had no male issue—he enfranchised her. The son died at the end of the year, and, according to Arabian usage, Maria, having ceased to be a slave, was likewise obliged to resign a position which had been similar to that of Hagar in Holy Scripture. Mahomet's unwillingness thus to part led to quarrels with Hafsa, one of his wives, and subsequently with the rest. Hafsa he divorced, and the rest he kept separate for a month; but on the intercession of his fathers-in-law, Omar and Abu Beker, reinstated all into their old positions. He had first, however, by a fresh addition to the Koran (chap. lxvi.) freed himself from the oath he had made to Hafsa to resign Maria; and, in the same chapter, lectured his wives for their revolt.

Those who believe Mahomet to have been in the main sincere, may yet consider that on these, and some other occasions, he was inconsistent. Those who denounce him as wholly hypocritical, have, of course, not failed to make the most of such an extraordinary course of procedure. The former of these conclusions is the one hinted at by Gibbon and Mr. Carlyle; and followed in the main by Dr. Weil, Mr. Irving, M. Renan, and others: the latter is that of men so different as Dean Prideaux and Voltaire. There is, however, a third line of argument, that, namely, in palliation of Mahomet's conduct, which is vigorously urged by Dr. Möhler. And it is only fair that it should be set forth; which we proceed to do, without committing ourselves either to the acceptance or rejection of the professor's views upon what appears to us a very curious and difficult question of psychology.

Digitized by Google

Möhler, then, after narrating, almost as we have done, the above transactions, asks what judgment we are to form upon them? do they not indicate the most thoroughly conscious deceit? Such, he observes, was the opinion of Voltaire, who supported his view of Mahomet by reference to the affair of Zayd. But 'I,' he replies, 'hold such a view to be unhistori-'cal; and maintain that if one admits the possibility of his own 'individual impressions, ideas, and thoughts passing, without 'suspicion, for divine inspirations, I cannot perceive the impossi-'bility of his considering God to be the author of all his other 'inward impulses.'[1] He then refers to the Herodotean account of the practice of the daughters of Babylon at the temple of Mylitta,[2] and similar disgraceful customs in Carthage, Malta, Cyprus, Phœnicia, Syria, and India, (he might have added Nicaragua and Peru,) as a proof how men may come to regard the basest rites as allowable, and even divinely authorized. Mahomet, he proceeds to say, was in the above transactions inspired by the same spirit as these,—to wit, an earthly spirit (*Erdgeiste*). It was certainly a relapse into sheer paganism: 'but it is like-'wise,' adds Möhler, 'at the same time clear, that he might be 'convinced of the divinity of that inspiration, and act upon it 'in good faith. The *bona fides* of Mahomet is especially evi-'dent from this, that the two events in question were the 'occasion of two *Suras* (*i. e.* chapters) of the Koran. Surely 'he would never have immortalised them in this manner, if 'he had been conscious of evil.'[3] He further demands, how it came to pass that these events caused no diminution of the respect paid to Mahomet, as a prophet, by his followers; and were not adduced until modern times, to raise any doubt concerning his sincerity?

Such is the defence of Möhler. We leave it to do its work, simply observing, that while the phrase of an 'earthly spirit' seems somewhat lenient in such cases, and suggests the other epithets which an inspired writer has on one occasion added,[4] yet that learned men (we give an instance in a foot-note)[5] corro-

[1] 'Ich halte eine solche Betrachtungsweise für unhistorich und gestehe, dass ich, wenn man die Möglichkeit zugibt, seine individuellen religiösen Empfindungen, Vorstellungen und Gedanken für gottliche Inspirationen ganz arglos auszugeben, die Unmöglichkeit nicht begreife, Gott auch als Urheber seiner übrigen inneren Bewegungen zu betrachten.'—P. 368 (note).

[2] Herod. book i. c. 199. He calls it, ὁ αἰσχιστος τῶν νόμων.

[3] 'Es leuchtet aber auch zugleich ein, dass er von der Göttlichkeit jener Inspiration überzeugt seyn und *bonâ fide* handeln konnte. Die *bona fides* Mahommeds ist aber besonders daraus ersichtlich, dass ihm die beiden beigebrachten Thatsachen Veranlassung zu zwei Suren gaben. Gewiss aber würde er das Andenken an dieselben nicht in dieser Weise verewigt haben wenn er sich des Bösen bewusst gewesen wäre.'—P. 369.

[4] S. James, iii. 15.

[5] 'Neque omninò ò corruptis Babyloniorum moribus hunc morem explicari posse

Digitized by Google

borate this view of Babylonian rites, and that the subsequent arguments are certainly deserving of the fullest consideration. But whatever be the reader's conclusion on these points, there remains an amount of positive evidence for the general sincerity of Mahomet, the force of which it is most difficult to gainsay. It may be, that the power of allurement which spiritual conquest over other hearts possesses for a mind like his, is somewhat overlooked by Irving, Caussin, and even by Möhler. But, taking into account the natural workings of an ardent imagination (exalted by meditation and solitude) on one who appeared at a season when many of his countrymen were looking for fresh light, and some even expecting the advent of a prophet; the late period of life at which he announced his mission; the conviction of Kadijah, and of others most dear to him, who had known him from his earliest youth; the endurance for twelve years of every species of raillery, insult, and persecution; the utter rejection of all offers of wealth and chieftainship, when made on the condition of his discontinuing his efforts; the simplicity of his mode of life to the very last (dates and water frequently the only food of himself and his household, and sometimes no fire in the house for a whole month); the thorough confidence in-wrought into the minds of such men as Omar and Abu Beker; we cannot, we repeat, see in this man the merely ambitious conqueror, or the deceiver without faith in himself or his own mission.[1] And then, again, the Koran: poor and monotonous as it may well appear beside the pages of the inspired seers of Israel; wearisome as its perusal must soon prove to us, who read it divested by translation of all charms of diction and of rhythm; yet does it, after all, look like the production of a mere impostor? Möhler recognises in it 'a very 'original piety, a moving devotion, a thoroughly individual 'religious poetry, which cannot possibly be forced or artificial.' And how is it possible, he eloquently asks, that a religious fire, wild though it may have been, which in so astonishingly short a period set all Asia in flames, could go forth from one in whom the kindling material had no real existence? 'Many 'millions of men,' he continues, with some change of metaphor, 'feed and foster from the Koran an estimable religious and 'moral life; and one cannot believe that they are drawing from 'an empty spring.'[2]

---

aut origines cepisse, quivis, me vel non animadvertente, sentiet. Ad ipsam enim religionem pravasque de diis conceptas opiniones respiciendum esse, ubi hæc et talia legimus, vix dubitandum,' &c.—Bähr in Herod. lib. i. cap. 199; (tom. i. p. 445. Lipsiæ, 1830.)

[1] See Möhler, p. 370; Caussin (Preface); Irving; Carlyle, &c. [2] Ibid.

Digitized by Google

It is our earnest wish to expose with faithfulness, as we proceed, the grievous defects of the Mahometan creed, and the sins and short-comings, no less than the virtues, of the leading races which have adopted it. But considering, for a moment, merely the amount of influence (apart from the further question, whether it has been for good or evil) which Islamism has exercised, we cannot bethink us of any sheer impostor who has left such traces of his footsteps as has its founder. Zoroaster and Pythagoras may possibly be compared to Mahomet, in respect of the kind, if not the degree, of impression which they made. But unless it can be distinctly *proved* that they likewise were consciously deceivers, there is no room for reasoning from analogy from their cases to that of Mahomet, it being the very condition of this species of argument, 'ut incerta *certis* probet.' And, in truth, with all respect to the memory of a pious and truly learned author, to whom students of ancient history are deeply beholden,[1] we are by no means convinced of the existence of imposture in the sages either of Bactria or of Samos.

We have said that we are not prepared to enter at any length into the causes of Mahomet's success. In declining to investigate so important a branch of the subject, we may appear to be taking a leaf out of the writings of those Mahometan historians of Turkey, who, as M. Ubicini informs us,[2] refer everything to a Will above man, in such wise as to dispense with examination of the causes of events, or their probable results in the future. Such a mode of handling history is, indeed, neither Christian nor philosophic. Yet it may be allowable to suppose, that the contrary extreme is likewise evil; that the annalists and critics of the West, who seem almost to have adopted as their motto, the Virgilian—

'Felix, qui potuit *rerum cognoscere causas*,'

may likewise be sometimes leading us astray. The previous state of Arabia (of which we have been endeavouring to afford some idea); the actual amount of truth which was taught by Mahomet; the principles acquired, directly or indirectly, from Christianity; the points of contact with the past, and with all the religions then obtaining in his country; the elegance and purity of the language of the Koran, and its applicability to law and the practical business of life; the native force of its author's mind, and the courage and confidence thence infused into his warriors; the evident need, if it may be said with

[1] Dean Prideaux, Connexion, &c. Part . book iv.

[2] Page 239.

Digitized by Google

reverence, of some great scourge upon idolatry; all these have been named as probable causes of the success of Mahometanism, and we are not prepared to assert that they did not, each and all, contribute to the great result. But that they form a complete and satisfactory explanation, we cannot, for our own part, pretend to feel: and if they accounted ever so completely for the first propagation of Islamism, they would still fail to reveal the secret of its extraordinary permanence and freedom from change; a point which, after all, as Gibbon observes, is more wonderful than even its first success. Rather should we be disposed to admit, in the somewhat quaint but forceful language of Sir Francis Palgrave, 'That after all our cogitations, we are 'coerced to acknowledge that blessings and judgments are 'equally inscrutable: that many failures are unaccountable, 'and many successes inexplicable; legitimate expectations of 'good sorely disappointed—good resulting from evil—large 'promises and small forthcomings; or the hap and the half-'penny turning to ten thousand pounds.'[1]

We must not, however, pass in silence one reason, which is usually alleged in our popular histories, and to which Gibbon has lent the sanction of his authority; that indulgence, namely, of voluptuousness which Mahomet has permitted in this world, and promised in the next. Those who have thus far followed our line of reasoning, will not be surprised to find that we agree with Mr. Hallam and Mr. Maurice,[2] in thinking that the influence of this motive has been much exaggerated. There may indeed be much truth in an observation of Dr. Arnold's,[3] that 'the unworthy idea of Paradise in the Koran justifies the 'ways of God in not revealing' [that is, we presume, fully and clearly revealing] 'a future state earlier, since man in early 'ages was not fit for it.' But the unseen is with the mass of mankind so far less potent than the visible and tangible world around them, that it is probably to the licence of the present life, rather than to the anticipations of a future state, that Gibbon, and those who follow him, mainly refer. On this point we cannot do better than cite the remarks of Mr. Hallam.

'Although the character of the founder of Mahometanism may have been tainted by sensuality as well as ferociousness, I do not think that he relied upon inducements of the former kind for the diffusion of his system. We are not to judge of this by rules of Christian purity or of European practice. If polygamy was a prevailing usage in Arabia, as is not questioned,

[1] History of Normandy and England, vol. i. page 128.
[2] On the Religions of the World,' Lect. i. page 27.
[3] Life. Note to Appendix C.

Digitized by Google

its permission gave no additional licence to the proselytes of Mohammed, who will be found rather to have narrowed the unbounded liberty of oriental manners in this respect; while his decided condemnation of adultery, and of incestuous connexions, so frequent among barbarous nations, does not argue a very base and accommodating morality. A devout Mussulman exhibits much more of the Stoical than the Epicurean character;[1] nor can any one read the Koran without being sensible that it breathes an austere and scrupulous spirit; and, in fact, the founder of a new religion or sect is little likely to obtain permanent success by indulging the vices and luxuries of mankind. I should rather be disposed to reckon the severity of Mohammed's discipline among the causes of its influence.'[2]

The most recent researches certainly tend to confirm this view. Mr. Hallam mentions among the severe requirements of Mahometanism, the long fasting, the pilgrimages, the regular prayers and ablutions, and the abstinence from stimulating liquors. Yet these injunctions, great as is the self-denial they involved on the part of his first followers, who had been passionately fond of drink, and apparently not much shackled by any burden of ordinances, did not constitute the whole, perhaps not even the most trying portion, of his demands. Besides the condemnation of the wicked practice of destroying female infants,[3] (which his precursor Zayd had so forcibly denounced,) Mahomet forbade all illicit intercourse, beyond the bounds of marriage or concubinage; all usury; all games of chance; all divinations by arrows; all hostilities between tribes which had once accepted the creed of Islam. Most of these are trying restraints upon the will of the natural man. Games of chance are everywhere popular, alike in Christendom and heathendom. Bourdaloue, in his very strict sermon *Sur les Divertissemens du Monde*, after cutting off the great majority of the worldly amusements of his audience, yet leaves them the liberty of play, provided the time be not unduly extended, nor duties neglected, nor the sums at stake excessive. The Arabs, as has been observed, were devoted to gambling, insomuch that men had been known to lose all that they possessed, and then to stake their freedom, forfeit it, and become slaves. Divinations have always been popular, (witness the success of fortune-tellers even in Europe,) and the particular mode of divining by arrows, known by the name of *Kidâh* or *Arlâm*, had been practised in every emergency by the countrymen of Mahomet.[4] Yet how are these things treated in the Koran?

---

[1] Compare M. Ubicini, in his somewhat too favourable estimate of the Turk (p. 497): '*Il y a en lui toute la force d'âme du Stoïcien, moins l'insensibilité.*' We doubt the justice of the latter clause.

[2] Middle Ages, chap. vi. vol. ii. p. 114, Tenth Ed.

[3] Koran, xvi. 60, 61; Ubicini, pp. 502, 503.

[4] We have not space for a description of this mode of divination, but the fol-

Digitized by Google

'O true believers, surely wine, and lots, and images, and divining arrows, are an abomination of the work of Satan; therefore avoid them, that ye may prosper. Satan seeketh to sow dissension and hatred among you by means of wine and lots, and to divert you from remembering God and from prayer; will ye not therefore abstain from them? Obey God, and obey the apostle, and take heed to yourselves; but if ye turn back, know that the duty of an apostle is only to preach publicly.'[1]

These injunctions were enforced with a high hand, and although it be most true (as Mr. Hallam intimates) that strictness possesses a winning influence peculiarly its own, that numbers everywhere can sympathize with the sentiments of Dr. Johnson on this head, and the oft-recurring thought of our late Laureate, respecting 'the weight of too much liberty,' yet it is evident, that by many of the Arab tribes the restrictions were at first much felt as a very sensible diminution of their licence. Thus, for example, when El-Acha, a poet of very great celebrity, (and, like many of their poets, a keen satirist upon occasion,) had composed a panegyric upon Mahomet, and was journeying to present himself to the new teacher; certain hostile Koreishites, alarmed at the idea of such an accession to the cause they were opposing, bribed him with the splendid present of a hundred camels to desist from his intention. But they did not have recourse to this huge donative, until they had first attempted, though in vain, to deter him by a prospect of the self-denial, which the profession of Mahometanism would entail. 'Our compatriot,' said they (for Mahomet, as we have said, was of the tribe of the Koreish), 'will forbid you things of which you are extremely fond.' And they proceed to name the points above referred to, licentiousness, games of chance, usury and wine. It was when these remonstrances proved futile, that their spokesman, Abou-Sofyân—but we will not here risk spoiling, by translation, the *naïveté* of M. Caussin's narrative:—'Abou-Sofyân dit alors aux Coraychites: "Si 'El-Acha se rend près de Mahomet et s'attache à lui, il enflam-'mera par ses vers les Arabes contre nous. Donnons-lui cent

---

lowing most characteristic story will give some idea of the kind of procedure:—The prince-poet, Imroulcays (of whose *Moallacat* or prize-poem we have given a specimen), was burning to avenge the murder of his father. He consulted an idol much revered by the Arabs, named Dhou-l-Kholoss. His pointless arrows were three in number, and bore the words *command, prohibition, delay.* He shook them together and drew out *prohibition.* Dissatisfied, he begins over again, and thrice following comes forth *prohibition.* Upon this he takes the arrows, breaks them and throws the pieces at the idol's head, exclaiming:—'Wretch! if it were thy father who had been killed, thou wouldest not have forbidden his being avenged.'—*Caussin*, ii. p. 310.

[1] Chap. v. 92, 93.

Digitized by Google

'chameaux, pour lui fermer la bouche."'[1] El-Acha took the bribe, but was thrown and killed on his road homeward.

This event happened in A.D. 628. About two years later, the tribe of Bacrites bethought themselves of submission to the new creed. One consideration, however, restrained them; 'The 'religion of Abdelmottalib's grandson,' said they, 'forbids those 'who embrace it to make war upon each other; it pronounces 'sentence of death against the Mussulman who slays a Mussul- 'man. We shall be obliged to give up attacks and pillage of 'those tribes who, like ourselves, have adopted Islamism.' At length they made a compromise with their consciences. 'Let 'us make one more expedition against the Témim, and then 'we will declare ourselves Mussulmans.' Four days saw the Bacrites across the southern boundary of Irak, a space usually occupying eight days of travel; suddenly did they fall upon the Témim in the plain of Chaytayn, slaughtered numbers, and carried off their cattle. The injured Témim sent a deputation to the prophet, entreating from him a curse upon the authors of their calamity. But Mahomet declined; he knew of the disposition of the Bacrites, and had no desire to estrange them. Very shortly after, they were all among the number of his proselytes.

Now, although El-Acha was dissuaded by a bribe, and not by the dread of sacrifice of his inclinations, and although the schoolboy-like feeling of the Bacrites did not prevent them from ultimately becoming Mussulmans; yet, surely, in either narrative we may trace the conviction, that to adopt Mahometanism was esteemed a piece of self-denial, and not an acquirement of more licence, either of thought or action.

It remains that, in accordance with our promise, we attempt to describe the relation of Mahometanism to paganism and to Christianity. The latter branch of this inquiry ought to include, perhaps, some slight notice of the leading races (besides the Arabs) which have adopted it. But the accomplishment of such a task would carry us far beyond our present limits.

And firstly, then, as regards paganism. Writers of the most opposite schools of thought—we may instance Mr. Forster and Dr. Newman[2]—concur in representing Mahometanism as a kind of half-way creed, if we may so speak, between paganism and Christianity; excellent in comparison with the religions of heathendom, execrable when confronted with the faith of Christ. Such portraiture of Islamism demands respect, from

[1] Tom. ii. pp. 402, 403.

[2] Forster, 'Vindication of Mahometanism Unveiled,' p. 31; Newman, pp. 105, 106.

Digitized by Google

the mere circumstance of its having been drawn by learned men who have contemplated the subject from such different points of view. Neither do we purpose to deny that it is in the main correct; but inasmuch as it seems to us to need some modification, so far as regards paganism, we shall venture to draw out formally a sketch of the strong and weak points of Mahomet's teaching, when considered with reference to the heathen creeds. And as, in the prosecution of this portion of our task, we shall derive but little assistance from other writers, we must the more bespeak the indulgence of the reader for any mistakes into which we may fall, while, at the same time, we cannot complain if he should look more watchfully for their occurrence.

The three great errors of paganism, are Epicurism, pantheism, and polytheistic idolatry. The doctrine of Epicurus may not indeed be directly and immediately responsible for the conduct of all who called themselves Epicureans; but it is hard to prove that their general behaviour did not logically flow from their master's tenets. When once a man has taught that the gods have enjoyed for ever a perfect happiness, undisturbed alike by the trouble either of creating, or of governing the world, he is further removed from deism, than even deism itself from true religion.[1] Between such doctrine and sheer atheism, there is, *practically*, no real difference; the Lucretian doctrine, of a creation from a concourse of atoms, follows as truly as the Horatian carelessness and love of pleasure. The consistent Epicurist sees not God in the marvels of nature, nor seeks to influence him by prayers.

From miracles, be they genuine or feigned, he will turn away with supercilious contempt:—

> 'Credat Judæus Apella,
> Non ego. Namque Deos didici securum agere ævum;
> Nec, si quid miri faciat natura, Deos id
> Tristes ex alto cœli demittere tecto.'[2]

His comrades he will naturally exhort to imitate the Beings who are above them:—

> 'To live and lie reclined
> On the hills like gods together, careless of mankind.
> For they lie beside their nectar, and the bolts are hurl'd
> Far below them in the valleys, and the clouds are lightly curl'd

[1] Dean Prideaux, in the Preface to his 'Life of Mahomet,' has spoken to this effect; but the statements of the text were first suggested to the writer by the MS. of a highly gifted friend.

[2] Horat. Sat. lib. i. vv. 100, 103.

Digitized by Google

Round their golden houses, girdled with the gleaming world;
Where they smile in secret, looking over wasted lands,
Blight and famine, plague and earthquake, roaring deeps and fiery sands,
Clanging fights, and flaming towns, and sinking ships, and *praying hands*.'[1]

Most justly did Cicero, in opposition to this heartless, hopeless creed, maintain with the Stoics, the existence of a particular, as well as a general, Providence in the government of the universe: 'Stabit illud quidem .... de quo agimus, Esse Deos, et eorum 'providentiâ mundum administrari, eosdemque consulere rebus 'humanis, nec solum universis, verùm etiam singulis.'[2]

The pantheist, too, if he carry out his doctrines to their legitimate conclusions (as is done by the Hindoos) may easily bring himself to believe that the eternal and immutable distinction between right and wrong is a delusion, however necessary for our guidance in this life. For by deifying nature, and thus confusing the Creator and the created, he makes the Almighty to be all things, and each individual soul a part of the *Anima Mundi*, the one great soul of the universe. Thus every act of man becomes an act of the Divinity; and as the Deity cannot do wrong, so neither, properly speaking, can man. Unpardonable as is this self-deification in those who have been nurtured in Christian lands, it yet possessed a winning aspect for very pure and lofty minds among the ancients,[3] as a reaction from the grossness of the popular belief. With them pantheism was often perhaps the expression of a dim groping after two great truths; the one, that in Him who made us, 'we live, and move, and have our being;' the other, that men's highest bliss must consist in becoming 'partakers of the Divine nature.' But its teachers erred grievously, in that they denied the existence of a personal God, and reduced their Creator to a mere philosophic abstraction; they erred grievously, in that they made union with Him to be of such sort, as that man should become *of one substance* with the Eternal, and lose his own individuality by being absorbed into the Divine essence.

But even worse, perhaps, fared those who added 'drunkenness to thirst,'[4] (if we may adopt Bishop Andrews's explanation of those words,) by taking refuge from atheism in polytheism, and the worship of images. The close connexion between polytheism and idolatry has been commented upon by S. Athanasius[5]

[1] Tennyson, 'Lotos-Eaters.'—The entire passage is as exact, as it is poetical.
[2] De Divinatione, lib. i. cap. 50. § 117.—Cf. De Naturâ Deorum, lib. ii., of which a large part is occupied in establishing this position. 'Nec vero universo generi hominum solùm, sed etiam singulis à Diis immortalibus consuli et provideri solet. Licet enim contrahere universitatem generis humani, eamque gradatim ad pauciores, postremò deducere ad singulos.' (Cap. 65. § 164.)
[3] For instance, Virgil, Georg. iv. 219—227: Æneid, vi. 724—729.
[4] Deut. xxix. 19. [5] Cont. Arian. iii. 8.

Digitized by Google

and S. Austin.[1] There were no images in any country until religion became corrupted; Varro admitted that the Romans had for more than a hundred and seventy years worshipped the gods without an image: Plutarch (and, we believe, Pliny) bear witness to the same effect.[2] 'And if this had endured till now,' adds Varro, 'the gods would have been more purely served.'[3] Not only is idolatry most offensive to Him who is a jealous God, in that it gives His glory to another, but likewise because it appears to have the power of putting men into connexion with the unseen world, and establishing a fellowship with evil spirits; in which, perhaps, the essence of its exceeding sinfulness may lie. 'They provoked Him to jealousy with strange gods, with 'abominations provoked they Him to anger. *They sacrificed* 'unto devils, not to God; to gods whom they knew not, to new 'gods that came newly up, whom your fathers feared not.' '*They* 'sacrificed their sons and their daughters unto devils, and shed inno-'cent blood, even the blood of their sons and of their daughters, 'whom they sacrificed unto the idols of Canaan.' 'Are not they 'which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar? What say 'I then? that the idol is anything, or that which is offered in 'sacrifice to idols is anything. But I say, that the things which 'the Gentiles sacrifice, *they sacrifice to devils, and not to God:* 'and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils,' (*οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς κοινωνοὺς τῶν δαιμονίων γίνεσθαι*).[4]

Now against all three of these capital errors; against Epicurean or pantheistic notions of the Deity, and, still more vigorously, against idolatry, Mahometanism utters and enacts a most direct, a most energetic, and, on the whole, a most successful protest. We say, upon the whole, for it is not to be denied that the creed of the Schiite Mussulmans has admitted a pantheistic element, the mystic theology commonly known by the name of Soffeeism. This arose from the influence of the Persian mind after the conquest of that country by the Moslems: and hence Soffeeism has found its way into Turkish as well as Persian poetry, as most of the poets of these countries belong to some order of Dervishes,[5] and these devotees are the

---

[1] De Civ. Dei, lib. v. cap. 31.

[2] A very learned writer (Morris, 'Essay towards Conversion of Hindus,' p. 226) supplies the following list: Herod. i. 131 of the Persians, and iv. 59 of the Scythians; Tacitus, Germ. cap. ix. of the ancient Germans; Eusebius, Præp. Evang. pp. 274, 275 of the ancient Seres and Brahmans; Windischmann of the Chinese (p. 348); and Rubbi (xi. p. 171) of the native Americans. The same writer is full of information upon Brahmanism and idolatry.

[3] 'Quod si adhuc mansisset, castiùs dii observarentur.'—Varro, cit. ap. S. Aug. de Civ. Dei, v. 31.

[4] Deut. xxxii. 16, 17; Ps. cvi. 37, 38; 1 Cor. x. 18—20; Cf. verse 21; also Levit. xvii. 7; 2 Chron. xi. 15; Rev. ix. 20: and Ps. xcv. 5, as in the Septuagint.

[5] Taylor's Hist. of Mohammedanism, p. 307.

Digitized by Google

supporters, as indeed they were the originators, of this intrusive element. But although there has hence arisen a dangerous species of mysticism, we see no reason to believe that the disciples of Mahomet have, in the slightest degree, yielded to the temptation of disbelieving in the personality of the Almighty. And, assuredly, the God of the Koran is no Epicurean deity; so completely is all that is done in the universe regarded as His work and will, that even the research into secondary causes is, as we have observed, almost abjured. And, lastly, as regards idolatry, it has been seen, in that affecting history of Zayd the son of Amr, how he forbade men to eat the flesh of victims which had been sacrificed to idols, an injunction displaying a spiritual instinct so deep and true, as to incline us to think, that had his life been spared, he might have become a Christian like his three companions. And though Mahomet may have been in character inferior to his precursor, yet the progress of himself and his followers in the destruction of idol shrines, is undoubtedly the most grand and striking feature of their history. Never was Mahomet greater than on that memorable day, when he rode on his camel seven times around the Caba, and had the three hundred and sixty idols overthrown and crushed beneath his feet, saying, 'The truth has come, let falsehood disappear.'[1] Never were the Mahometan conquerors so thoroughly the instruments of the righteous vengeance of God, as when in Hindostan they disregarded all difficulties of country, of climate, of weather, all multitudes of enemies, all hostile appliances of war, the elephant and the armed vessel and the walled fortress, all bribes however fabulous in amount, so that they might utterly demolish those idolatrous temples, which had in every way become the haunts of diabolical wickedness. And, truly, obedience to the law of their creed proved, at the same time, the best earthly policy. Most readers of the history of India must have been struck with that incident in the life of Mahmood, when for a moment he paused in the infamous shrine at Somnaut, and gave ear to the enormous offer of the Brahmins, who would fain have saved its idol from the common doom; but then, recovering himself, proceeded in his work of destruction, and was repaid, not merely by the approval of his conscience, but by the magnificent outpouring, from the interior of the shattered image, of diamonds, and pearls, and rubies, beyond number.

But over and above these protests against errors, Mahometanism teaches many things clearly, which paganism of every kind had, in a greater or less degree, lost, or at best was teaching vaguely. Eternity and a judgment to come, fixed dogmas,

[1] Caussin, tom. iii. p. 230.

Digitized by Google

fixed rules of right and wrong, the existence of real revelations; these and other truths did the Arabian gain from Judaism and from Christianity. One other point we venture to mention, because we have not seen it named by any writer upon the subject of Mahometanism, namely, that Mahomet appears to have taught a reasonable doctrine of penance. The idea of penance is, indeed, very deeply seated in the human heart; it is a great mistake to imagine, that the rejection of distinctively Roman teaching on this head involves the rejection of *all* doctrine concerning it. On the contrary, that very important rule of S. Gregory, 'to cut off indulgence in things lawful, where we know that we have committed what is unlawful,' may be illustrated and enforced, not only from the Prayer-book and Homilies of the English Church, but likewise from writings whence it might be least expected; from the poetry of the Puritan Spenser, and from the treatises of Bishop Burnet and of Calvin.

'Since we ought,' (says the last named, commenting upon the very important word *revenge* in 2 Cor. vii. 11;) 'since we ought to do vengeance upon sins wherever they exist, nor that alone, *but more particularly to begin with ourselves;* the saying of the apostle has a wider range, for he is speaking of the signs of penitence. This one is conspicuous among the rest, since, by punishing our sins, we in some wise anticipate the judgment of God. As he elsewhere teacheth, "If we would judge ourselves we should not be judged," of the Lord. Not, however, that it is to be hence inferred, that men, by exacting punishment of themselves, can compensate for punishment due to God, so as to redeem themselves from his hand. But thus the matter stands, since it is the design of God, by chastening us, to destroy our heedless security, so that, warned of his wrath, we should henceforth take heed to ourselves: *when the sinner himself previously taketh spontaneous revenge, he does away the need for such an admonition of God.*'[1]

An illustration of the Mahometan doctrine on this point will be found, (if so abrupt a descent from comments upon Holy Scripture may be pardoned,) in that portion of 'The Thousand and One Nights,' which contains the adventures of the Caliph Haroun-al-Raschid.

'At the foot of the bridge they met with an old blind man, who asked for their alms; the Caliph turned, and put a piece of gold into his hand. The blind man presently caught hold of his hand and stopped him. "Charitable person," said he, "whoever you are, that God hath inspired

[1] 'Cæterùm quia peccata debemus *ulcisci* ubicunque sint; neque id modò, sed à nobis potissimum incipere: latius patet quod dicit apostolus: loquitur enim de signis pœnitentiæ. Hoc unum est insigne inter reliqua; dum peccata vindicando, Dei judicium quodammodo antevertimus. Quemadmodum alibi docet, Si nos judicaremus, non judicaremur utique à Domino. Neque tamen hinc colligendum est, homines vindictam à se exigendo, compensare pœnas Deo debitas, ut ab ejus manû se redimant. Sed ita se res habet, Quum Dei consilium sit, nos castigando, securitatem nobis excutere, ut de irâ ejus commonefacti, caveamus nobis in posterum: quum spontaneam ultionem peccator ipse præoccupat, facit ut tali Dei admonitione non sit opus.'—Calvinus, in loc. cit.

Digitized by Google

to bestow his alms, do not refuse the favour that I ask you, to give me a box on the ear, for I deserve this and a greater punishment." After these words he let the Caliph's hand go, that he might strike; but for fear that he should not, held him fast by his clothes.'

When the man has told his story (which the reader can refer to in any of the old editions—for it is not given, we believe, in Mr. Lane's version),[1]

'The Caliph said, Baba Abdallah, thy sin is great; but God be praised! thou knowest both the enormity of that, and thy penance. As for thy first, thou must ask God's pardon for it in every prayer thy religion obliges thee to say every day.'

Now it is true that such ideas, though very hard, we imagine, to discover in Greek or Roman writers, were common in the East; and have, in many parts of Asia, been developed into very terrible and superstitious practices. But Mahometanism, if we mistake not, is utterly opposed to any Hindoo notion of abstract merit in penance, apart from religious sentiments in the heart of the doer of the penance (the doctrine so vividly pourtrayed in Southey's 'Curse of Kehama'); even Mahomet himself is held to have been accepted into Paradise by divine mercy alone, and not for any presumed good deeds; and the Koran, while it implies that one who has acted wrongfully cannot by mere regret, and by undoing (where it is possible) his actions, be restored at once to his former position, yet enjoins a kind of self-denial which may often prove beneficial to others, besides the offender himself. Thus, for instance, it was easy for an Arab, in a moment of vexation, to repeat the short *formula* which divorced a wife: it was easy to repent of such a step: but the book of the Moslems does not allow of a simple renovation of the tie. The man must pay a penalty for his fault.

'Those who divorce their wives, by declaring that they will for the future regard them as their mothers, and afterwards would repair what they have done, shall be obliged to free a captive, before they are re-united. This is what ye are warned to perform: and God is well apprized of that which ye do: and whoso findeth not a captive to redeem, shall observe a fast of two consecutive months. And whoso shall not be able to fast that time, shall feed threescore poor men. This is ordained you, that ye may believe in God and his apostle.'[2]

Another very important feature in the creed of Islam, is the sense of brotherhood with which it is calculated to inspire those who profess it. With the one exception of the ruler, Caliph or Sultan, all Mahometans are equal: difference of social position may indeed result from wealth, and from the possession of civil or military office; but such difference is not hereditary, and may

[1] This does not affect, we believe, its value for our purpose, though we cannot stop to give the grounds of our opinion.

[2] Koran, chap. lviii. sub init.

Digitized by Google

at any moment be utterly reversed by change of circumstances, or the *fiat* of a despotic ruler. Such notions are strangely opposed to the extremely haughty and aristocratic feelings of the ancient Arab tribes. The change, however, does not appear to be accidental, but to have been deliberately contemplated by Mahomet. 'Koreishites,' said he, on the day when he destroyed the idols at Mecca, 'no more pagan arrogance, no more pride 'built upon ancestry! All men are children of Adam, and Adam 'was formed out of the dust.' And he recited a verse out of the Koran. 'O men, verily we have created you of a male and a 'female, and we have distributed you into families and tribes. 'The common object of your existence is a brotherly society. 'The most honourable in the eyes of God is he who fears Him 'most. To God belongeth wisdom and knowledge infinite.'[1] Moreover, every Moslem, of whatever race or wherever he dwells, is considered by the mere profession of Islamism to have been symbolically grafted into the Arabian race, and when he prays with his face towards Mecca, to be united in the sanctuary of the common stock.[2] Such teaching we may allow with Möhler to be in advance of Judaism, since it is reflected from the light of that Faith for which Judaism was but the preparation. Certainly it is no mere theory, but a living idea, which has exercised great influence upon the Tartar races. An intelligent and observant traveller, Lieutenant Wood,[3] virtually ascribes to this, and some other tenets of Islamism, the apparently innate self-respect and gravity, even of the poorest Mahometans; and, if we remember rightly, M. Huc declares that the Chinese dare not treat with injustice Mahometan residents of the Celestial Empire; because it is well known, that, though comparatively few, they have a common bond, both social and spiritual, and that any ill-treatment of one would be taken up as a common wrong by all.

Concerning that truly noble idea of spiritual filiation, we shall have something more to say presently. The degree of success which has attended, or can attend, the attempt to offer Islamism to every race, and again, the amount of connexion between this creed and the intellectual development of humanity, open questions far less favourable to Mahomet and his work than the points on which we have now been dwelling. But let us not shrink from allowing it its full due. On the one hand the Marabout, as a Mahometan priest is called in Africa, teaches to the degraded children of Ham reading and writing, along with

[1] Caussin, tom. iii. pp. 231, 232. Koran, chap. xlix. 13. We have here followed the version of M. Caussin, which slightly, but not substantially, differs from that of Sale.

[2] Möhler, p. 393. [3] Cited by Dr. Newman, pp. 86, 87.

Digitized by Google

the belief in Eternity, and in a living, almighty, all-wise and good God, and produces a marked and sensible improvement, insomuch that the traveller would always choose, if possible, for a place of rest a village where a Marabout is living:[1] on the other hand, the courts of Bagdad and of Cordova undoubtedly patronised the labours of the intellect, and the throne was surrounded by multifarious, if not very original, science and learning. 'You only sent for a barber,' says the persecuting chatterbox in the tale, 'but here in my person you have the best barber in 'Bagdad; an experienced physician; a very profound chemist; 'an infallible astrologer; a finished grammarian; a complete 'orator; a subtle logician; a mathematician perfectly well versed 'in geometry, arithmetic, astronomy, and all the divisions of 'algebra; an historian fully master of the histories of the king-'doms of the universe: besides, I know all parts of philosophy; 'I have all the traditions upon my fingers' ends. I am a poet, 'I am an architect; nay, what is it I am not? there is nothing 'in nature hidden from me.'[2] In some of these branches of knowledge, Europe is certainly under obligation to the *Saracens*, as the Arabs got named in the West. Those numerals which betray, in their very forms, their Eastern origin by opening towards *the left*, instead of, like Western alphabets, to the right,[3] were brought into Europe by them, and effected a perfect revolution in arithmetic. Algebra was at least made known to us through them, so far as to preserve its Arab name; and Alchemy, which, however futile in itself, proved a most useful handmaid to real chemistry, betrays a similar derivation.[4] We hear on all sides of their commentaries upon Aristotle: even Dante does not refuse to name

'Averroes, che il gran commento feo;[5]

And Sismondi thinks that their poets exercised considerable influence upon the taste and genius of the Troubadours.[6] Mahometan literature is, however, too large a subject to receive anything like justice at our hands, though we must add a word or two hereafter respecting one of its leading features. One more of the qualifications claimed by the barber, we must just allude to, we mean the architectural skill of the Saracens. The Turks have not, we believe, produced anything in this respect worthy of admiration; on the contrary, their buildings are said to be heavy, badly proportioned, and destitute of genius. But it was far otherwise with the first promulgators of Islamism. They

[1] Möhler, p. 386. [2] 'Thousand and One Nights.'—Story told by the Tailor.
[3] For instance, compare a 5 with an *e*, a 3 with a *c*, &c.
[4] Chambers's Cyclopedia, articles *Algebra* and *Alchemy*.
[5] Inferno, iv. 144.
[6] De la Littérature du Midi de l'Europe, tom. i. chap. iii.

Digitized by Google

had a style which was really their own, and sprang out of their creed. 'The architecture of the Arabs,' says Mr. Owen Jones,[1] 'is essentially religious, and the offspring of the Koran, as Gothic 'architecture is of the Bible. The prohibition to represent 'animal life, caused them to seek for other means of decoration; 'inscriptions from the Koran, interwoven with geometrical 'ornaments and flowers, not drawn decidedly from nature, but 'translated through the loom; for it would seem that the Arabs, 'in changing their wandering for a settled life, in striking the 'tent to plant it in a form more solid, had transferred the luxu-'rious shawls and hangings of Cashmere, which had adorned their 'former dwellings, to their new, changing the tent pole for a 'marble column, and the silken tissue for gilded plaster.' Mr. Ford observes, that it might have been added, that the palm-tree was the type of the columns which they used in their court-yards *(patios)*. How brilliant was their success, we know, not merely from records, but from actual remains. Even now, when the spirit of the nineteenth century would fain collect in its Crystal Palace the finest specimens of the art of the most varied climes and ages, it is compelled to devote one of its chambers to the reproduction of one of the courts of the exquisite Alhambra!

But with all these features of superiority, there still remain points wherein, as it seems to us, Mahometanism is decidedly inferior to some of the other false religions of the world. We mean that there are certain needs in human nature which the creed of Islam does not satisfy, and which other religions have at least attempted to satisfy. Writers who are anxious, as we are, to do justice to the merits of the Arab-born creed, but too often, we think, ignore this side of the question.[2] It is not touched upon in any of the works which are named at the commencement of this article. And yet, unless it be duly taken into account, we shall surely obtain an imperfect, and perhaps an unduly favourable, estimate of Mahometanism.

Let it be granted, that the religions against which the Moslem hosts prevailed, had become exceedingly corrupt; and that it was not merely the power of the sword which laid them low: let it be granted, that there is a salt in Islamism, which has hitherto preserved it from a like corruption, from a like departure from its own original principles: still these religions found food for some cravings of the human mind, which were, in themselves, neither wrong or unnatural. Thus, for example, it is natural, and it is right, to imagine that the Divine nature

[1] Cited in Mr. Ford's 'Handbook for Spain,' sec. iii. p. 372.

[2] Mr. Maurice is an exception.—Religions of the World, p. 56, et alibi.

Digitized by Google

must in itself, and much more when viewed by our finite comprehension, be full of mystery; it is natural to seek for something which shall bridge over the vast gulf between the human and the Divine, the Creator and the created; it is, above all, natural to seek to propitiate the Almighty by offering sacrifice, and by thus softening the otherwise appalling notion of Almighty power, as a thing before which man must simply prostrate himself, to associate the performance of duties with soothing rites, and temper fear with love. How fully Christianity supplies all these needs; how clearly it proclaims that, as there is a mystery of iniquity, so likewise is there a mystery of godliness; how thoroughly the doctrine of the One Mediation and the One Sacrifice, from which all other sacrifices derive their worth and meaning, is its central verity, we have already hinted, and must not, for the moment, pause to enlarge upon; but it is important to observe, that Magianism and the better forms of Buddhism, and even classic paganism, possessed something in these respects which Mahometanism has not. Magianism, though it had done its work when Mahomet appeared, and lost its pristine excellence, had probably been of real service in preparing the way for Christianity. That noble nation, whose religion it was, has the glory of numbering among its monarchs the one great heathen type of Christ our Lord; Cyrus, the destroyer of Babylon, the restorer of the chosen race to their home in Palestine. Thinkers, so differently trained as Keble, Hengstenberg, and M. Nicolas, agree in extolling both Persia and its creed, as among the best and fairest specimens of heathendom.[1] A triad of deities, one eternal and two created and visible, of whom one fulfilled the office of Mediator; the immortality of the soul; the fall of the first man; the life to come, its bliss and punishment; resurrection of body and soul, and the three degrees of purity—purity of thought, of word, and of action; these doctrines are all claimed for the religious system of the Persians by a learned living writer;[2] though the teaching may probably have been somewhat vague and dim, and was evidently mixed up with much that was erroneous. Hence, we cannot but suspect, the strength of the Schiite schism among the believers in Islamism; the mere question whether the three first Caliphs were usurpers or not, and whether Ali ought not to have immediately succeeded Mahomet, could hardly have led

[1] 'Ne . . . nobili Persarum genti, *quam proximè à suis Hebræis caram fortasse habuit Divina Majestas*, iniquiores esse videamur.' Keble, Prælect Acad. (tom. ii. p. 819); Cf. Hengstenberg; Preface to Christology of the Old Testament. M. Nicolas, *Etudes Philosophiques sur le Christianisme*, tom. ii.

[2] M. Felix Lajard, *Lettre sur les Traditions Assyriennes et Persanes*, appended to the second volume of M. Nicolas' *Etudes Philosophiques*.

Digitized by Google

to such serious and lasting results. But an admixture of the idea of mediation, of union of the divine and human in one nature, and of other ancient Persian tenets, would at once give a subjective basis to a schism which was, at its commencement, rather personal and political, than religious.[1]

Take again the case of Buddhism. We are not about to defend its morality or its theology; though M. Huc's account of the Thibetians should certainly be weighed in the balance as well as the unfavourable portrait which others give of the Hindoo and Cingalese professors of this creed. In any case, Buddhism now possesses some deep and holy truths, however acquired. And so, likewise, does Brahmanism. We have before us, while we write, Wilkin's translation of that very curious Sanscrit work, the 'Bhagvat-Geeta,' which contains the system of those worshippers of Kreeshna, called the *Bluktahs*. A note, furnished by the present Bishop of Brechin, to Archdeacon Grant's most interesting Bampton Lectures, invites our attention to the following passage, as hinting at the Christian doctrines of remission of sin and the effects of faith, and of man's union with the Object of all true worship:—

'"'Those who serve me with adoration, I am in them, and they in me. If one, whose ways are ever so evil, serve me alone, he is as respectable as the just man; he is altogether well employed; he soon becometh of a virtuous spirit, and obtaineth eternal happiness. Recollect, O son of Koöntëe, that my servant doth not perish.'[2]

Now, as the work whence this extract is taken is of the tenth century, and consequently coeval with the Mahometan conquest of Hindoostan, it may easily be conceived that men, who could imbibe such sentiments, would regard Islamism with little favour. And thus indeed it proved: Mahomet's disciples smote Indian idolatry, and that most righteously; but forasmuch as their creed, in its bare and rigid Monotheism, did not correspond to the needs of the mystic and contemplative Hindoo, even the sword of Mahmood failed, in the long run, to win the convictions of the mass of the inhabitants.

And with respect to rites of sacrifice: sad and shocking as it was that an offering like that of Abel should have been trans-

[1] Taylor's 'History of Mohammedanism' (chap. vii.) quite justifies us in taking this view of the Schiites, and thereby regarding the Sonnites as the truer Mussulmans. It is a sad blemish on this work, which is replete with curious and useful information, that its author commits the unpardonable error of asserting, more than once, that Mahomet taught the doctrine of the incarnation (p. 7 and p. 46). The Koran is *as explicit as possible* in denying the divinity of our Lord, though it admits His miraculous conception.

[2] Bhagvat-Geeta, lect. ix. In the same chapter occur the following striking words:—'I am the sacrifice; I am the worship; I am the spices; I am the invocation; I am the ceremony to the manes of the ancestors; I am the provisions; I am the fire and I am the victim.'—Krëeshna is the speaker throughout.

Digitized by Google

ferred from the true and living God to his rebellious creatures, the fallen angels; yet in the existence of the rite itself, and the many points of agreement in its mode of performance by all nations, how much of deep and solemn truth was involved; truth, assuredly, which needed to be purified and disentangled from masses of superstition, but not to be lost sight of and forgotten. In the selection of a victim as innocent as possible, and likewise one *near humanity* (tamed animals, as the sheep or the calf, never wild ones—as the boar or wolf, being employed), in the infliction of a blood-shedding death, the knife, not the strangling cord, being the instrument; in the consumption of part of the victim by fire, and the rest by the ministrants and the people; in all these leading features the nations of the universe were at one. All recognised thereby, however dimly and unconsciously, man's need of that Atonement which, in the divine counsels of God the Holy Trinity, was offered 'before the foundation of the world;' all admitted that repentance alone could not avail to blot out sins; all entreated the acceptance of a substitute for their guilty selves:—

'Cor pro corde, precor, pro fibris sumite fibras:
Hanc animam vobis pro meliore damus.'[1]

That Mahomet should either continue the sacrifices of blood, or, failing that, should have grasped the idea of spiritual and bloodless sacrifices, was not perhaps to be expected. But in that his doctrine concerning the Godhead stands, as it were, bare and lonely; in that the interval between man and his Maker is left in all its vastness; in that with the loss of sacrifices, he lost much solemn truth conveyed in such ritual; he has thereby framed a religion devoid of some things, which the better among the heathen had retained; and thus far justified the pointed comment of Schlegel upon himself and his work, as the spectacle of '*a prophet without miracles—a faith without mysteries, and a morality without love.*'

These words of Schlegel bring us naturally to another branch of our subject, the relation, namely, between Mahometanism and the Gospel. In attempting to investigate this problem, it is only fair to ask what ideas Mahomet himself has promulgated upon so very important a point. We may then add some comments of our own upon any real features of resemblance, as well as of contrast.

Now the first remark to be made is, that the Koran is inconsistent on this head. Not, indeed, that this is a solitary instance

[1] Ovid, Fasti, vi. 161, 2.—These striking lines are quoted by M. Nicolas, from whose chapter on sacrifices we have drawn largely.—'Etudes Philosophiques,' livre ii. chap. iv.

Digitized by Google

of its inconsistency; for the Mussulmans, according to M. Renan, recognise 225 contradictions in the Koran[1],—that is to say, 225 passages, which were abrogated by its author as a consequence of some change in policy. But the inconsistency is, in this case, unusually striking and important. In one set of passages Christianity is recognised as equally good with Mahometanism; in another it is merely a preparation for it, as Judaism had been for Christianity.

The mere fact of any view, however self-contradictory, being thus put forth, shows that Mahomet was compelled to recognise the existence both of Judaism and Christianity. He could not ignore them, as a Hindoo teacher might have done: the adherents of both creeds in Arabia were too numerous and too influential to admit of such a course. But, in truth, he had no such desire; the recognition of these religions in some way was compulsory upon Mahomet, quite as much from inward convictions, as from any force of external circumstances. No uninspired teacher ever seems to have felt more deeply the impossibility of grafting a religion upon his own subjective notions merely; none sought more anxiously to win for his doctrines an objective and historical basis.[2] In asserting that he came to restore the religion of that great Patriarch, the Father of the Faithful, he at once appealed to associations admitted to be most sacred both by Jew and Christian, and reverenced by numbers more, even of his idolatrous countrymen, with that honour paid everywhere, but most especially in the East, to the memory of a founder of a race:—

'Abraham was a model of true religion, obedient unto God, orthodox, and was not an idolater: he was also grateful for his benefits; wherefore God chose him and directed him into the right way. And we bestowed on him good in this world: and in the next he shall surely be one of the righteous. We have also spoken unto thee, O Mohammed, by revelation, saying, Follow the religion of Abraham, who was orthodox, and was no idolater.'[3]

And although there is real difficulty in ascertaining the precise amount of knowledge of the Bible which Mahomet possessed, inasmuch as apocryphal gospels, and all imaginable forms of heresy concerning the nature of our Lord, were rife around him, yet it seems certain that, either in the course of his travels, or from intercourse with his wife's cousin, Waraca, the most learned Arab of his time, he had gained at least a general idea of Scripture history, and the true Gospels and the Talmud.[4]

[1] Möhler, p. 351. [2] Möhler.
[3] Koran, chap. xvi. 120—123.
[4] Caussin, tom. i. p. 353.—It seems to us quite possible, as Mr. Hallam and Mr. Taylor think, that Mahomet had never actually read any part of the New

Digitized by Google

Some men there are who have influenced their own generation and posterity, who stand single and apart in history. Such in the world of politics are Julius Cæsar and Napoleon Buonaparte: such in the world of philosophy are Pythagoras and Socrates. On the other hand, Augustus could hardly have had a career, so far as we can judge, without the prior work of his great relative: the present Emperor of the French (he would be the first to acknowledge it), whatever powers he may have displayed, has yet no political existence apart from that of his uncle. In like manner, the Alexandrian school of Greek philosophy is as nothing without Socrates and Plato to fall back upon: and so, too, in the far more solemn matter of distinctly religious teaching, it may be said that, apart from the revelations of God's true messengers, neither Mahomet nor his book have any being. 'Without Moses and the prophets and Christ, Mahomet is simply inconceivable:'[1] without the Old and New Testament, the Koran could never have been imagined.

Pascal[2] demands, concerning Mahomet, what mystery he revealed, what miracles he worked? To these queries the Mussulman can give no satisfactory reply. That the greatest of all prophets should teach nothing, which had not been known, even in patriarchal ages, is an admission surely ruinous to his claims. And the demands of his Arabian opponents, sarcastic as was their tone, do not appear in themselves unreasonable.[3]

'Since thou dost not approve our proposals, and persistest in declaring thyself sent by Allah, give us some evident proofs of thy claim. Our valley is narrow and barren; prevail on God to enlarge it, to remove further apart these mountain chains which enclose it; to send into it rivers, like those of Syria and Irak, or to raise from their graves some of our ancestors, and amongst them Cossay, son of Kilâb, whose word had such weight; let these illustrious dead acknowledge thee for a prophet, and we will acknowledge thee also.

* * * * * * * * *

At least, resumed they, ask thy Lord to cause one of his angels to appear to bear witness to thy truth, and command us to believe in thee. Ask Him, too, to show openly the choice He has made of thee, by relieving thee from the necessity of seeking thy daily subsistence in the markets, like the humblest of thy fellow-countrymen.'

The spirited replies of Mahomet to such remarks,[3] though

Testament. Indeed, as M. Caussin remarks, '*Il est douteux qu'il sut lire et écrire.*' Such ignorance is of course quite compatible with a general, however imperfect, knowledge of Christian doctrine.

[1] 'Ohne Moses, die Propheten und Christus ist Mahommed undenkbar' (Möhler, p. 353), for, as he adds, 'der wesentliche Inhalt des Coran ganz dem alten und neue Testamente entnommen ist.'

[2] Pensées, Seconde Partie, art. xii. § vii. [3] Caussin, tome i. p. 378.

[4] 'God,' rejoined Mahomet, 'has not sent me to you for this. He has sent me solely to preach His law. I fulfil my mission, and I repeat,—If you accept that

Digitized by Google

fairly enough appealed to as evidence of his sincerity, yet leave the difficulty untouched. If he claimed only to be a restorer of forgotten faith, still God had never left even the restorer of Judaism, Elias, without the witness of miracles, any more than its founder, Moses. It must have been, in part, the sense of this deficiency, which has led the Persian and Turkish annalists, to embellish the narrative of the false prophet's life with so much fable. Nor could Mahomet himself, though he frequently said that the composition of the Koran was his only miracle, preserve entire consistency in this respect. The famous nocturnal journey to heaven, known as *Isra*, though regarded by the more judicious of his followers as a vision, was yet announced by himself as matter of fact. It brought on him a perfect storm of ridicule, and led many to renounce him and his creed. Pascal, however, likewise asks, with no less reason, whether this latest of prophets had himself been foretold: '*Ce prophète, qui devait être la dernière attente du monde, a-t-il été prédit?*' Now seeing that, as Bishop Butler observes, miracles and prophecy are the proper proofs of a revelation, the absence of miracles seems to increase the need of prophecy. And of this, too, Mahomet was evidently conscious, though Pascal does not seem to have been aware of the circumstance. He accused both Jews and Christians of having falsified their sacred books, by expunging passages bearing reference to his appearance.[1] His disciples did not however allow that this work had been so thoroughly effected as to leave *no* Scriptural testimony in favour of their prophet, and maintained that certain texts of either Testament distinctly pointed out his advent. One of these, which is well known, is too painful to dwell upon; we mean the blasphemous (we believe, the quite unconsciously blasphemous) interpretation of S. John, xvi. 7; where the followers of Mahomet, as those of Manes had done in an earlier age, understood the Paraclete to mean their new teacher. That Mahomet himself was under some extraordinary misapprehension in this respect seems tolerably clear from the following words of the Koran:—

'Jesus, the son of Mary said, "O children of Israel, verily I am the apostle of God sent unto you, confirming the law which was delivered before me, and bringing good tidings of an apostle who shall come after me, and whose name shall be Ahmed." [Ahmed being, as Sale remarks, another form of Mohammed.]'[2]

The Persian paraphrast attempts to support this passage by

which I bring you, it will be your happiness in this world and in the next. If you reject my advice, God will judge us.' (Caussin, ibid.) Cf. Koran, chap. xxv. ad init. which is equally straightforward and vigorous; indeed, Mahomet's arguments with his countrymen seem to display a thorough belief, mistaken though it was, in his own mission.

[1] Möhler. Cf. Sale, Notes to Koran, chap. ii. [2] Koran, chap. lxi.

Digitized by Google

reference to the above-mentioned text of S. John.[1] Another text of these Moslem doctors, is Psalm l. 2, where, with the aid of the Syriac, they try to wrest the words 'perfection of beauty' into meaning the 'crown of Mahomet.' In a third very curious instance, they would fain lay hold upon that connexion of mountains with religion, which is so frequent among all nations,[2] and which divine inspiration has condescended, if we may so speak, to ratify; as will be admitted by any Christian, who thinks for one moment on the ideas associated in his mind with the names of Mount Sinai, Mount Tabor, and Mount Calvary. If, then, we can grant to the Mahometans that Mount Seir is a mountain in Galilee, or near Jerusalem, instead of being in Idumea; and that Mount Paran means the hills round Mecca, instead of that mountain in Arabia Petræa, near which Moses began to deliver his law, and which is distant from Mecca some 500 miles; then, but not otherwise, can they appeal with success to the words of Moses, in Deut. xxxiii. 2, as a setting forth of three revelations, the Jewish, Christian, and Mahometan. Such, however, is the Islamite interpretation:—

'The Lord came from Sinai, [Judaism.]
And rose up from Seir unto them, [Christianity.]
He shined forth from Mount Paran.' [Mahometanism.]

One more like application of Scripture remains, certainly by far the most ingenious. The seventh verse of the twenty-first chapter of Isaiah stands in the Vulgate thus: 'Et vidit currum duorum equitum, *ascensorem asini, et ascensorem cameli.*'[3] Herein, say these Eastern critics, is clearly signified the advent of the two great prophets; the prophet of Christianity who rode into Jerusalem upon the ass; the prophet of Islamism who was constantly mounted upon his camel. Now the many excellent persons who maintain that the Bible is always sufficient to interpret itself, will be ready to assert that *they* at least could never have been deceived by such a manifest perversion of its sense. Certainly, those who have been nurtured in the fold of Christ's Church, 'the witness and keeper of Holy Writ,' and for whom a thousand sacred influences outward and inward have given to the written word its illuminating power,[4] are not very

[1] Sale, *in loc.*

[2] Möhler reminds us of Olympus among Greeks; Mount Maru, the source of the Ganges, with the Hindoos; the hills causing the cataracts of the Nile, with the ancient Egyptians; the Albordi of the Persians; and the Phrygian title of Cybele, 'the mother of mountains,' p. 355.

[3] In the English version the latter part runs thus:—'A chariot of asses, and a chariot of camels.' Vitringa gives a kind of *via media:* 'vecturam asinorum, vecturam camelorum.'

[4] See the admissions even of Sir J. Stephen (no supporter of Church authority) in this respect, 'Essays in Eccl. Biography,' vol. ii. p. 199.

Digitized by Google

likely to be perplexed by such a reference. The Christian student will be content, with learned commentators,[1] to see in this chapter of Isaiah a general picture of the advance of Cyrus against Babylon, with a possible allusion (but this is a private fancy of our own) to that conqueror's ingenious employment of the camel against the cavalry of Crœsus; admitting, of course, that the spiritual fulfilment may be in store in the ultimate conquest of the mystical Babylon by the *true* Cyrus. Nevertheless, if we had been brought up from infancy to regard this verse from a Mahometan point of view, it would probably be very difficult for us to unlearn our traditional interpretation.[2]

But to return to the contradictory enunciations of the Koran respecting Christianity. The following passage is one of those which is favourable to the 'four people of the book,' as Mahomet termed the professors of those religions which had, or claimed to have, a written revelation.

'Surely those who believe, and those who Judaize, and 'Christians and Sabians, whosoever believeth in God, and the 'last day, and doth that which is right, they shall have their 'reward with their Lord; there shall come no fear on them, 'neither shall they be grieved.'[3]

But in the very next chapter, according to the existing order, we read, 'Whoever followeth any other religion than Islam, it 'shall not be accepted of him, and in the next life he shall be 'of those who perish.'[4]

In attempting to account for this divergence, we shall chiefly follow the admirable guidance of Möhler; and even where we make remarks which are not directly traceable to his Essay, they will yet most probably have been prompted by his original and most suggestive hints.

Möhler observes that one way of extracting a decisive sense from the Koran, in this respect, has been sought by a mere enumeration of passages upon either side, with the intent of adjudging the palm to the majority. Such a method he naturally rejects, as being neither very profound nor philosophical.

Another, and certainly a more plausible, solution of the difficulty is offered by the very common assertion that the favourable passages are those of Mahomet's earlier life, while the hostile and exclusive ones belong to his later career, and consequently abrogate the previous *dicta*. This account of the matter is very largely assumed, and of course coincides with the views of those who, with Gibbon, esteem Mahomet sincere at first, and an impostor afterwards. But, without reopening

[1] Vitringa in loc. *item* Cornelius à Lapide.

[2] These texts are given by Prideaux, Life of Mahomet: and one of them (Deut. xxxiii. 2) likewise by Maracci (cit. ap. Möhler).

[3] Koran, chap. ii. [4] Ibid. chap. iii.

Digitized by Google

this part of the question, it must be observed that the chronological view, even though it should prove true, is by no means easy of proof. The Koran, as is well known, was not reduced into its present shape until after its author's death; and Abu Beker, its first editor, having collected the chapters, (which were in a disjointed state, on skins and palm-leaves and bladebones,) placed, as a rule, the longest chapters first, and the shortest last,[1]—a plan admirable for its simplicity, but not conducive to a clear comprehension of Mahometan doctrine.

While other writers attribute this change on Mahomet's part to the mere inflation produced by success, and his growing ideas of consequence as a statesman and warrior, Möhler penetrates more deeply, and arrives at the conclusion, that the turning-point of the whole is to be found in the fact, that *Mahomet commenced his career merely as the prophet of Arabia, and by degrees persuaded himself that he was the destined prophet of the world.* We cannot afford space for the various arguments by which the learned and thoughtful essayist maintains and, in our judgment, establishes this position; but a brief statement of the important consequences which would naturally result from such a change in the author of the Koran, will, we trust, be found interesting and important in itself, and at the same time confirmatory of the correctness of the theory.

It is evident that this account of the matter does not militate against the chronological view. There is good reason to believe, from a number of historical facts, that hostility to Christianity *is* the *later*, and therefore the true, doctrine really deducible from the Koran, though it cannot be proved from the book alone.

Sabian idolaters could not long remain on terms with one who pounded their images into dust. The Jews, though a few accepted Mahomet as no bad representative (as in truth he was not) of their carnal notion of a Messiah, yet in the main scorned the idea of submission to one who proclaimed himself to be the descendant of the bondswoman, Hagar; and thus became, as Dean Milman[2] truly remarks, his first opponents and the first victims of his sanguinary teaching. The zeal of the son of Abdallah was awakened against the Jews much sooner than against the Christians; indeed a singular passage in the fifth chapter of the Koran contrasts *Jewish* with *Christian* reception of Islamism, to the great advantage of the Christians; a circumstance accounted for by the favour shown towards some fugitive Mussulmans on the part of the Christian king of Ethiopia.[3] All this, however, was perfectly compatible with

[1] Sale and others. [2] Hist. of Jews, vol. iii. p. 243.

[3] Sale's Notes to Koran, *in loc.* Cf. Caussin, tom. i. p. 388, *et seq.* This event took place in A.D. 615, seven years before the Hegira.

Digitized by Google

the earlier and more restricted claims of Mahomet. The Jewish tribes had opposed him even within the confines of Arabia. But when once the conviction had settled upon his mind, that he was to be the teacher not of a nation only but of the world at large, Christianity must needs appear to him in a different light. There are, as Möhler observes, only two possible inward relations between systems in connexion with each other; the relation of co-ordination, and the relation of subordination. When Mahomet commenced his career, thinking only of Arabia and her needs, he regarded Christianity as a religion *co-ordinate* with that he preached; when, extending his sphere of thought and action, he looked upon the whole of God's earth as the object of his mission, he was obliged to regard Christianity as *subordinate* to Islamism. If Christians would not acknowledge this, they became enemies to the creeds of Islam, and must be treated accordingly: though, like the other 'people of the book,' they might be permitted, on becoming tributary, to escape that death by the sword, which was to be the fate of unbelievers, who did not even pretend to a revelation.

What temper of mind it was that produced this change in Mahomet, who, with mere mortal eyes, can pretend to judge? Of a more worldly conqueror Manzoni has magnificently sung:—

'La procellosa e trepida
Gioja *d'un gran disegno*,
L'ansia d'un cor, che indocile
Ferve pensando al regno,
E'l giunge, e tiene un premio
Ch'era follia sperar,
Tutto ei provò; *la gloria*
Maggior dopo il periglio
La fuga, e la vittoria.'

But although these glowing words might be transferred to a description of some portion of the inner, as well as the outer, life of Mahomet, they would still describe a portion only. The logical connexion between Monotheism and a World-Religion, whereas idolatry had always been peculiarly local: the deepening conviction of the truth of many of his first principles (and they were in the main most true); the strange growth of spiritual ambition, a spell more potent than even the lust of wealth and temporal power, though the last may not have been wholly absent from the mind of Mahomet; the physical and mental condition of one subject to fits of epilepsy, and so affected that even Kadijah feared that he was possessed by an evil spirit; the countenance given to his mistakes respecting Christian doctrine by the perverse teaching of the sad heresies around

Digitized by Google

him; the fatal manner in which any one great error may lead to more, and become a powerful instrument in the hands of Satan for the deterioration of character; all these jarring and conflicting elements, who, we repeat, of mortal men can combine and harmonize, so as to pronounce a safe and confident verdict?[1]

In pursuing the line of thought thus laid open, we shall find ourselves gliding almost imperceptibly from *Mahomet's* view of the relation between Islamism and the faith of the Cross, to ideas which are, we hope, more consonant to a Christian aspect of the subject.

In attempting to become a Universal instead of merely a National Prophet, Mahomet was evidently unconscious of the far larger demands, if we may so speak, which would be made upon both his creed and character.

Nearly all the national religions are inseparably bound up with the State. We see this not only in the case of the false creeds of Paganism, but likewise in that of the divine creed of Judaism, which we know to have been eminently national. Mahomet, in trying to found a universal religion, retained this idea, and therefore virtually sought to found at the same time a universal Monarchy. He was himself Priest and Prince, *the one, because the other;* the earliest Caliphs were likewise High Priests;[2] and if the Ottoman Sultan does not actually exercise priestly functions, yet the Mufti who does exercise them is only his representative. Hence the singular circumstance that in Turkey a *jurist* and a *divine* go by the selfsame name of *Ulema*. Hence, in theory at least, all Mussulmans should recognise one sovereign only, whose authority is unique and absolute; and the Mahometan Princes of Hindostan and the Emperors of Morocco have acknowledged their subjection to the 'Ottoman Lord.'

But this element of a national religion, how shall it ultimately suit a creed which pretends to universality? Judaism owned such a feature, but then Judaism did not pretend to be a faith for all times and nations. No, though Mahomet failed to apprehend this, a religion which shall win the world must enjoy an independent existence of its own, capable indeed of union with any rational form of government, but equally

[1] For the proof of Mahomet's liability to epileptic fits, often, though not universally, preceding his visions, see the note to the sixth chapter of Mr. Irving's Life of Mahomet. Möhler (p. 379, text and note,) thinks that these attacks may be fairly compared with the bodily affections of the Montanists and, in a later day, the Jumpers.

[2] M. Ubicini (Lettre Sixième) denies this view of the Caliphate. But this writer, though most trustworthy in statistics, is not happy upon points of criticism or history. The best authorities are all against him here.

Digitized by Google

capable, if need be, of standing in the completest isolation. If this inseparable connexion imparted to Islamism no small amount of its first unity and strength, it is not difficult to show that it likewise contains within itself the seeds of disunion and decay.

A similar judgment may likewise be passed, perhaps, upon the use of the sword as an instrument of conversion. Under the elder dispensation, the Almighty had employed that dread scourge as the chastiser of guilty nations, whom He might have punished, had it so pleased Him, with a second flood, or with the fiery doom of the cities of the plain. Mahomet knew this well; he believed and inspired his followers with the belief, that they were as much thoroughly the divinely appointed scourges of God, as ever the Israelites had been. Now, we will not say that in conquest lay the secret of Mahometan success; herein we admit the full force of Mr. Carlyle's remark, that before you proceed to convert with the sword, you must first get your sword, and that the founder of every religion is at first in a minority of *one*. Neither do we pretend that war has had no share in the defence and propagation of the Christian faith. But most assuredly in no other creed is war a part of its very essence; no other religion ever admitted, as Islamism does, that too long continuance of peace endangered its vigour and vitality. This, again, is a feature which would of itself make the claim of Mahometanism to be a world-religion of the universe utterly hopeless and untenable. It knows nothing of universal love, it cannot imagine the union of special favour to its own, with benevolence to all; it cannot comprehend the maxim, 'Let us do good unto all men, but especially unto them who are of the household of faith.'

A similar result would probably follow from an investigation of its countenance of *the principle* of slavery. Granting the many humane provisions of the Koran, and of Turkish law and custom, with regard to slaves; granting, that Christian states, in both hemispheres, have been fearfully guilty at times in this respect, and have treated their slaves far worse than Turks and Arabs treat them, it still remains true that the Mediæval Church was the great instrument for the abolition of slavery in Europe, and that Christianity is at this moment the lever which will in time raise up slavery to freedom from the earth. The principle of slavery can never be recognised by a faith which is to subdue to itself all kingdoms of the earth.

There remains to be noticed the great *personal* distinction between the position of a national prophet, and a prophet of the universe, a distinction which Mahomet entirely failed to grasp, or even to catch a glimpse of. Heathen races have generally some *favourite* vices, respecting which the national

Digitized by Google

conscience is deadened; whence follows an equally faint approbation, perhaps a positive *dis*-approbation, of some particular virtues. These, however, will vary in different climates, and different ages; one nation will be shocked at sins which are unblushingly enacted by another; the heathen Germans and the heathen Romans, for example, could mutually condemn some glaring faults in each other's characters and moral practice. Now all that is, humanly speaking, required for the teacher of a race is, that he be a good man, *according to the standard of that race*. His disciples will not ask from him the inculcation of virtues of which they have never dreamt, nor the repression of vicious customs and ideas, which in their minds have long ceased to appear reprehensible. Such a teacher Mahomet might not irrationally, (however mistakenly as respects a *divine* mission,) claim to prove; whatever his faults, and they were in reality deep and terrible, there is yet no reason to doubt but that he was in the main *a good Arabian;* in few respects inferior to the average standard of his countrymen, in many respects extremely far above it. But the prophet of the world must be more than this; the morality which *he* teaches must accord, not with the conventional rules of his own peculiar age, or clime, or race, but with those eternal, unalterable, rules of right and wrong, wherein even God is a law unto himself; the doctrine which *he* imparts must satisfy all the *really* religious needs, not of this nor of that nation, but of humanity at large. He must be, in short, not merely a good Greek, a good Arab, a good member of any of the great human families, he must be emphatically *a good* MAN. A good man, nay, rather a perfect man; *a type and model of humanity.* And what son of man should there be found who could be capable of such an office? Who, since the fall of our first parent in Paradise, could suffice for such a task? Not even the holiest among fallen men, not Enoch nor Noah; not Abraham nor Moses; not David nor Elias; nor even the Holy Baptist; these were all great in their generations, endowed with Heaven-sent gifts for special times and circumstances; but for the office of prophet for all times and all nations, ONE alone was fit, *the one true and perfect man*, who is VERY AND ETERNAL GOD.

If true and saintly prophets could not avail for so vast a work, how far less one with no really Divine mission, a man blood-stained, and lust-stained, capable of treachery and fierce revenge, and withal unconscious of his shame.[1] And therefore,

[1] Neither the treacherous assassination of his Jewish enemies, nor the command to slaughter Nodar, son of Hareth, because he had satirised him, at all diminished his self-respect, nor the respect of the Arabians. Such deeds were not *crimes* in their eyes.

Digitized by Google

when the Arabian teacher proclaimed to all the nations round his celebrated motto, 'There is no God but God, and Mohammed is the Apostle of God,' he combined with a great and vital truth, a hopeless and tremendous falsehood. So long, indeed, as his followers turned eastward, and met with superstitions worse than their own, that truth held its way triumphantly,

> 'And overthrew, and scatter'd, and destroy'd,
> And trampled down;'

with something, it may be, of a blessing in its train. But when, in course of time, the influence of that false claim worked itself to light, and Moslems turned westward, and met the banners of the Cross, then, however much the sins and divisions of Christendom may have deserved the chastisement, they became tools of Satan, and supporters of his kingdom.[1] Denying alike the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, the verity of our Saviour's Godhead,[2] and the historical fact of his crucifixion,[3] claiming for their false prophet the place which is due to Christ alone, they must be regarded, within the pale of Christendom, as the abettors of a God-denying heresy.

We say a heresy, for there is no denying that the amount of truth in Islamism is such as to warrant the adoption of such a term in ordinary parlance, though not perhaps in the scientific language of theology. For there is, as Möhler has acutely remarked in another of his works,[4] one marked and leading distinction between Mahometanism and all heretical creeds, properly so called. Heresies, however much they may distort the Catholic faith concerning the person and office of our blessed Lord, yet agree in recognising in Him the first and best of all teachers, through whom the human race has received its last and highest religious culture. But Islamism does not make this admission; though Jesus be a great prophet, Mahomet is supposed to be greater. Bearing this weighty difference in mind, we may readily admit the many points of resemblance between Moslem and heretical teaching. We have heard a distinguished missionary of our Church, who has had practical experience of Mahometanism side by side with idolatrous beliefs, not long since express himself in this way concerning it; and De Maistre[5] quotes Sir William Jones, Leibnitz, Nicole, and the French Protestant minister, Jurieu, to the same effect. He might have looked yet further back. In the *Divina Commedia*, the great antagonist of the Church in the West is classed, not with the heathen, but with heretics and schismatics.

---

[1] Cf. Dr. Newman, p. 106. [2] Koran, chap. v. et alibi. [3] Ibid. chap. iv.
[4] Symbolism, ad init. [5] Soirées de S. Pétersbourg. Onzième Entretien.

Digitized by Google

'Vedi come storpiato è Maometto:
Dinanzi a me sen va piangendo Alì,
Fesso nel volto dal mento al ciuffetto:
E tutti gli altri, che tu vedi qui,
Seminator di scandalo e di scisma
Fur vivi, e però son fessi così.'[1]

And there is, indeed, one point on which the comparison of Mahometanism to a heresy most certainly holds good. It is a leading characteristic of heresy, that after the denial of some one or more portions of saving truth, it imagines itself to hold the remainder in the same way as the mind of the Church, nay, very often still more clearly, simply, firmly. Whereas, in reality, the truth which heretics still maintain, inevitably loses some vital portion of its character, by its isolation from the accompanying *dogmas*, to which it stood in a fixed and definite relation; it is held less firmly and completely than by the orthodox, who kept it in its due and proper place; it is held less clearly, and presents, to the really enlightened and sanctified reason, even greater difficulties than those which it strives to shun. The analogy of sounds and colours might serve to teach us this—these are not the same to eye and ear, when their relation is destroyed.

'Is not Truth *one* and indivisible?
Take from the Harmony a single tone—
A single tint take from the Iris bow.
And lo! what once was all, is nothing—while
Fails to the lovely whole one tint or tone!'[2]

If it be over-bold to term the residue *nothing* in such cases, we may yet say that it has become something very different from what it was. This is not, however, generally observed with respect to erroneous creeds, least of all with respect to Mahometanism. Let us look at the matter for one moment, then, in a few particulars.

The Church teaches the unity of the Divine Majesty and the Omnipotence of His Will. So does Islamism. But the Mahometan must bow prostrate before His Maker as a *Power*, and has nothing like mediation to soften this aspect of the Almighty. Do we assert that this truth exercises no influence over the Moslem mind? Far from it; with the better among them it causes much sedateness, pensiveness, and even melan-

[1] Dante, *Inferno*, xxviii. 31—36.

'Lo!
How is Mohammed mangled: before me
Walks Ali weeping, from the chin his face
Cleft to the forelock; and the others all,
Whom here thou seest, while they lived, did sow
Scandal and schism, and therefore thus are rent.'—CARY.

[2] Schiller (Bulwer Lytton's translation), Veiled Image at Sais.

Digitized by Google

choly.[1] It is, we know from revelation, the dogma, which even 'devils believe, and tremble.' But viewed in connexion with a Mediator, or apart from that connexion, it becomes subjectively, in the believer's mind, as well as objectively, an absolutely different doctrine. Nay, even the teaching of Mahometanism respecting the unity is not, in strictness of speech, identical with that of the Church. For Mahometanism teaches an unity of person, a doctrine probably harder for the reason to grasp (apart from its falsity) than that of the sublime and holy truth of the Trinity in Unity. It is at least worth while to listen to the words of Möhler upon this head. He denies that the monotheism of Islam can ever satisfy the philosophic reason. 'That the Godhead should be one person is utterly 'inconceivable, absolutely irrational, and opposed to all true 'speculation.'[2] And he adds, with a more startling boldness—yet may not this assertion be true likewise?—'that God has not become man is even a [moral] contradiction.'[3]

In respect of moral precepts, we own that the resemblance between Mahometanism and the Gospel is more marked. Hospitality and almsgiving (with a promise of greater blessing upon *secret* almsgiving) are strongly enjoined in the Koran, and have been duly practised by Mahomet's disciples. The resemblance of some of these commands to those of our Lord, is too great to be merely a coincidence. But even the moral precepts sometimes display ambiguity. It speaks in two opposite ways concerning revenge.[4] Can we marvel if Moslems should follow the *example* of their prophet, and be revengeful? How sublimely opposite, if we may even hint at a comparison without impiety, is the model which is set before the Christian.

Predestination is a point on which identity of opinion between the Mahometan and *many* Christians is often supposed to exist.

---

[1] A Spanish scholar points out to us Condé's account of Abdallah, king of Cordova (A.D. 922), and Abderrahman, his successor about 50 years later, as quite confirming this remark. (Hist. de la Dominacion de los Arabes en España, pp. 178, 227.) Abderrahman, a most pious Mussulman, when charged with melancholy, said, 'How can it be otherwise to man, who has the world for his house, and Eblis for his neighbour, who is perpetually writing down all his words, deeds, and thoughts.' (Condé, chap. lxxxvii. p. 227.) How differently might he have thought, could he have known of the meeting of Eblis with the Son of Man in the wilderness, and of all that hangs thereby! The pictures of the present Sultan of Turkey seem to reveal a like state of feeling.

[2] 'Dass die Gottheit eine Person sei, ist eben das ganz und gar Undenkbare, durchaus Unvernünftige, und aller wahren Speculation Entgegengesetze.'—P. 397. Bp. Jer. Taylor employs the English word 'speculation' precisely in this sense.

[3] 'Das Gott nicht Mensch geworden, ist eben das Widersinnige.'—Ibid.

[4] Koran, chap. xvi. compared with chap. xxii.

Digitized by Google

Such identity we cannot admit. It is true that the insuperable difficulty, to finite intellects, of reconciling the truth of the Divine prescience and government with man's free agency must underlie all religions. Christianity has not escaped the troubles arising from such perplexities; all theologians know how intimately this thorny question is connected with the great name of S. Augustine; all readers of history are aware of the part played among Protestants by Calvinism, and among Roman Catholics by Jansenism. M. Ubicini goes so far as to say, that neither Mahomet nor his commentators have spoken so strongly upon predestination, as S. Augustine. But we must again warn the reader (and the more, now that an English version of the book is being advertised) against following this very philo-Turkish writer, when he quits his one strong point, viz., statistics. Among Christians, even the most Augustinian in their tenets, the doctrine of election is tempered and modified by a thousand other influences. In Islamism it stands unmodified and alone. The inconsistent attempt of the Ulemas, to refer the doctrine to the spiritual life alone, fails, M. Ubicini himself admits to influence the mass of the people; on the contrary, the idea of fatalism seems never absent from their minds. We may grant, with him, that it lends a kind of dignity to the conduct of the Moslem under reverses; that no accident extorts a murmur, that if a fire has burnt down his house, a fraud robbed him of half his fortune, he says *kismet* (it was written), and passes uncomplainingly from a state of opulence to one of wretchedness.[1] But it would not be difficult to show that this feeling is something very distinct from the resignation of a true Christian. Indeed, M. Ubicini's own expression (before cited) of 'la force d'âme du Stöicien,' as applied to the Osmanlis, at once betokens the presence of a heathen idea. We cannot stay to dwell longer on the topic; but little more perhaps is required to suggest to the thoughtful reader, that neither in theory, nor in practical results, is the Mussulman doctrine of *kismet* identical with the Christian teaching concerning Divine Providence; to say nothing of the fact, that the words, even of so great a doctor as St. Augustine on this subject, have never been regarded as constituting an article of the Church's Creed.

If we have tried to make the fullest admissions that in fairness can be made on behalf of Mahomet and his creed, and its influence upon the human race, this arises, we trust, from a love of truth, and from a conviction that Christianity can never

[1] Ubicini. Lettre Vingtième, p. 497.

Digitized by Google

suffer from any equitable comparison. What one good thing does Islamism contain, in which the Gospel did not anticipate its teaching? The claim of the former to universal dominion may surely by this time be considered to be virtually negatived. Not only has it failed to triumph in the extreme East, but it has proved more signally weak in the West, where it never once succeeded in converting any single one of the great European families. Regard Mahometanism intellectually: we have already named the cycle of arts and sciences, in which the Saracens attained excellence. But even the Arabian intellect was receptive rather than originative. The researches of this century (incomplete, at present, we admit) have tended to lower the estimate of the literary wealth supposed to lie enshrined in the '*intactis Arabum thesauris*.' Mr. Colebrooke tells us that the Hindoos far excelled them in algebra. Condé[1] finds that numbers of their historians are but copyists from their predecessors; and even of their greatest names a recent French writer does not hesitate to say—'La science arabe est une science d'emprunt; 'pour savoir ce qui appartient à chacun d'eux, il faut les juger 'avec Aristote, Galen, Ptolémée, Euclide à la main.' This is said *à propos* of one so famous as Avicenna, concerning whom it is observed—'Comme la plupart des savants arabes, Avicenne est au-dessous de la réputation qu'on lui faite.'[2] And yet the Arabs are, intellectually, quite the first of Mahometan nations. We allow them poetry and fiction; but these gifts are thoroughly pre-Islamite, and owe little or nothing to Mahomet. Even of the greatest of Persian poets, Firdusí, it is doubted (though he lived after the Mahometan conquest of his country) whether he was not an adherent of the ancient national faith,—still a Gheber in his heart. In many regions of art, Mahometanism has no existence. Has it any Haydn, Handel, or Mozart? Sculptors and painters it cannot have. Yet what a void is here; how mighty, though insensible, has been the influence of Christian art! What would Europe be without its Giottos and Raphaels,—its Flaxmans and Thorwaldsens? Jurists, *properly speaking*, it cannot have. All legislation is shut up in the Koran. The realms of thought connected with Roman law, and all that it has done for Europe, are to the Moslem a sealed book. Commerce, so mighty an agent in the civilization of mankind, it can hardly pursue, for the entire system of modern finance involves transactions at variance with the Koran: and the merchandise of Turkey is in the hands of

[1] Ubi supra (Prologo).
[2] Nouvelle Biographie Universelle. Art. *Avicenne.*

Digitized by Google

Armenians and Greeks.[1] Above all, it has no spirit of progress: its false origin is here avenging itself: there is about it (to adopt the fine suggestion of Möhler) a spiritual and intellectual poverty, which betrays the limited and finite conceptions of a merely human author; whereas Christianity, in the manner in which it becomes 'all things to all men;' in its ceaseless adaptation to the changing needs of the most varied ages, climes, and races, partakes of the Divine and *infinite* Spirit of its Founder, and is exuberant with 'the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.'

Mahometanism knows nothing of the might of meekness: since it once gained an army of supporters, it has never exhibited to the world the spectacle of a suffering body: it has had indeed its fervid soldiers, but *no real martyrs.* What again (a crucial text this for a religion), what has it done for women? Granting that Mahomet in some degree exalted their condition among the Arabs, we need only glance at the accounts of Turkish harems, to feel convinced that Kadijah, and Ayeshah, and Fatima, have not been reproduced, nor even imitated, by the later daughters of the Moslem. The continuance of polygamy at all would prove fatal to its universality, perhaps even if Christianity were not at hand to confront it. It can never satisfy the needs of woman's heart.

But Islam will not perish till its work is done; and what is that work to be? A profound question, which meets with very contrary replies. Professor White, in a sermon appended to his 'Bampton Lectures,' spoke hopefully of the chances of converting Moslems, as distinguished from votaries of Buddhism or Brahmanism; Mr. Forster maintains that it must eventually prepare the way for the missions of the Cross, and claims the support of Mede and Warburton for his opinion; Möhler, who regarded the subject from a point of view the most opposite to that of Mr. Forster, yet displays in many respects a truly surprising amount of agreement with his views, and is sanguine that Mahometanism in Africa (where it has won converts by fair persuasion as well as by the sword), is doing the work which Judaism was at first divinely commissioned to effect, that of preparing the way for a purer faith in hearts as yet hard and stubborn, and incapable of its reception; so that one day the true labourers shall find a harvest ready for their reaping, and the Gospel speed thither on its way rejoicing, and Mahomet prove the servant of Christ.

[1] Cf. on these points, Lectures on the Turks, pp. 242, 243. Lord Lindsay (Progression by Antagonism), Mr. Maurice, Möhler, and others, question, and not without reason, how far intellectual development was ever a *bonâ fide* result of Islamism.

Digitized by Google

Visions these so bright and winning, so consonant to the glory of Christ's religion, so worthy of the triumphs of Him who is ever justified in His sayings, and overcomes when He is judged, and overruleth all to good, that we almost shrink from venturing even to hint a doubt of their correctness. We wish to believe them true; we dare not call them false: but it must be, though with regret, remarked, that they do not yet seem to have been ratified by the stern reality of facts. Rather do we fear, with Archdeacon Grant, that the system of the false Prophet 'offers the most formidable obstruction to the faith of Christ, from the fact of its being, as it is, a counterfeit of the truth itself."[1] Such fear is increased by the accounts of missionaries of the extreme difficulty of converting a Mahometan. One of our own Church to whom we have already alluded, told us, that though he would rejoice in hearing of any idolaters whom the Gospel *could not* reach turning Mahometans; yet that where the Malay (who is at present the Mussulman missionary) confronts the Christian priest, the only chance, humanly speaking, of the latter making a convert lay in his anticipating the teacher of Mahometanism. We do not wish, however, hastily to prejudge the somewhat peculiar case of Africa. Blessed indeed were it, if these sanguine expectations should prove true!

We have spoken chiefly of the Arab, or Saracen, Mahometans; whom we imagine to be the finest specimens of Mussulmans. But if there be a race, who have seldom, if ever, fought against pagan idolatry, but *constantly* against the Cross; who, though truthful, dignified, and amiable in repose, are cruelty personified when once aroused to deeds of blood; who are, as a nation, at once most proud and most depraved; under whose blighting yoke the most fertile portions of God's earth lie desolate and withering,[2]—how, it may well be asked, should Christians feel towards such a race? They may succour them if oppressed, for the Gospel teaches us to befriend all such; they must keep all promises, not in themselves sinful,[3] for the good man observes his plighted word, 'though it be to his own hindrance;' they must pray, earnestly and lovingly pray, especially on the anniversary of the Crucifixion, that He, the Crucified, would

---

[1] Bampton Lectures, Lect. vii. p. 227.

[2] It is with extreme reluctance that we omit the inimitably beautiful passages upon this part of the subject, contained in 'Lectures upon the History of the Turks,' (p. 138, *et seq.*) Dr. Newman may be naturally suspected of partiality, where he compares Italy with Turkey, but we can safely affirm that he has, in this respect, *under*-stated rather than *over*-stated his case.

[3] Cf. Dr. Newman's Preface.

Digitized by Google

have mercy upon them, that, being acknowledged by them in part, He may be acknowledged by them altogether, and may lead them, with all other misbelievers, into His flock; but really to sympathise with them is impossible. What pagan, what Mahometan race has shed the blood of so many thousands of Christ's people?

'The Saracens even, who gave birth to an imposture, withered away at the end of 300 or 400 years, and had not the power, though they had the will, to persevere in their enmity to the Cross. The Tartars had both the will and the power, but they were far off from Christendom, or came down in ephemeral outbreaks, which were rather those of freebooters than persecutors, or were directed as often against the enemies of the Church, as against her children: but the unhappy race of whom I am speaking, from the first moment they appear in the history of Christendom, are its unmitigated, its obstinate, its consistent foes. They are inexhaustible in numbers, pouring down upon the south and west, and taking one and the same terrible mould of misbelief, as they successively descend. They have the populousness of the north, with the fire of the south; the resources of Tartars, with the fanaticism of Saracens. And when their strength declines, and age steals upon them, there is no softening, no misgiving; they die and make no sign. In the words of the Wise Man, "Being born, they forthwith "ceased to be; and have been able to show no mark of virtue, but are con-"sumed in wickedness." God's judgments, God's mercies, are inscrutable; one nation is taken, another is left. It is a mystery, but the fact stands; since the year 1049, the Turks have been the great Antichrist among the races of men.'[1]

Not, we hope and trust, from any lack of patriotism, but in a spirit of truest love for our mother country, we may be permitted to regret that any circumstances should have rendered an armed alliance with Turkey so imperative.

The present war is essentially against Russian ambition; it is only accidentally in behalf of the Crescent: that it may be overruled to the establishment of the Cross again in Constantinople is at least a subject of patriotic and Christian hope.

Already, indeed, that admiration for Turks, of which we spoke at the commencement of this article, is beginning to evaporate. There can be no doubt that, as has been happily said, the Turk receives Christian succour—the succour of Giaours (men, that is, without souls) as he calls them,—in the same spirit as he might eat swine's flesh to save himself from starving. But if any of our readers shrink from accepting sketches of Turkish character at our hands, and would fain look into the subject for themselves, thus much of advice we may beg them to accept, namely, that they would be extremely cautious in

[1] Dr. Newman, pp. 127, 128.

Digitized by Google

trusting books of travel and the like, written *since the war has broken out.* Hardly any, not even Mr. Curzon's, are free from the evident mark of the pressure of the times. How different the tone of tourists but a short season before! Look at the graceful pages of 'Wayside Sketches; or, Seven Years' Wanderings among the Greeks and Turks.' Look at—but perhaps Mr. Thackeray is too professed a satirist for us to speak of his 'Cornhill to Cairo'—look at, then, the able pages of Mr. Bayle St. John's 'Turks in Europe.' Consider, for they are well worth considering (as suggestive of thoughts in danger of being ignored at present) the following words from such a man as Niebuhr:—

'In those *happier times*, when the Turkish empire was verging, without any hindrance, to its dissolution and ruin, through its own barbarism and wickedness; and when the Christians under its yoke were taking advantage of the growing sluggishness, rapacity, and shortsightedness of their tyrants, to lay the foundations of freedom for their posterity, which must have been attained but that the malice of fiends has converted the noblest hopes into the agonies of despair;—in those happier times, when much that was great and excellent was surviving here and there in that unfortunate country unobserved, and thus escaped being crushed and destroyed; some bands of free-spirited men retired from various parts of Epirus to the mountains of Suli. There was formed that people, whose heroism and misfortunes have left the Messenians far behind it, and the extermination of which, through the agency of the Franks, *will draw down the curses of posterity on our age*, long after all the guilty have been called before the judgment-seat of God.'[1]

All Europe is now condemning with the just voice of indignant reprobation the cruelties practised in the battle-field by the Russians, who are, thus far, more guilty than their Turkish opponents, in that Christianity should have taught them better things. We are not apologists for Russian barbarity in the soldier, any more than for Russian ambition in the Emperor; but our notices of Mahometanism would be *most unfair and incomplete*, if, after having allowed the most that can be said on behalf of Mahomet and his disciples in Asia and Africa, we should omit to touch upon the history of their anti-Christian deeds in Europe. A summary of a portion (and only a portion) of those deeds has been executed for us in a manner so far above anything that we can pretend to, that we cannot resist quoting it at some length:—

'I am not insensible, I wish to do justice, to the high qualities of the Turkish race. I do not altogether deny to its national character the grandeur, the force and originality, the valour, the truthfulness and sense of

[1] Niebuhr, Hist. of Rome, vol. i. p. 309. (Eng. Tr.)

Digitized by Google

justice, the sobriety and gentleness, which historians and travellers speak of; but, in spite of all that has been done for them by nature and the world, Tartar still is the staple of their composition; and their gifts and attainments, whatever they may be, do but make them the more efficient foes of faith and civilization.

* * * *

'I might allude, if I dare, but I dare not, nor does any one else dare, else allusion might be made to those unutterable deeds which brand the people which allows them, even in the natural judgment of men, as the most flagitious, the most detestable of nations. I might enlarge on the reckless and remorseless cruelty which, had they succeeded in Europe as they succeeded in Asia, would have decimated or exterminated her children; I might have reminded you, for instance, how it is almost a canon of their imperial policy for centuries, that their Sultan, on mounting the throne, should destroy his nearest of kin—father, brother, or cousin, who might rival him in his sovereignty; how he is surrounded, and his subjects according to their wealth, with slaves carried off from their homes, men and boys, living monuments of his barbarity towards the work of God's hands; how he has, at his remorseless will, and in the sudden breath of his mouth, the life or death of all his subjects; how he multiplies his despotism by giving to his lieutenants in every province a like prerogative; how little scruple those governors have ever felt in exercising this prerogative to the full, in executions on a large scale, and sudden overwhelming massacres; shedding blood like water, and playing with the life of man as if it were the life of a mere beast or reptile. I might call your attention to particular instances of such atrocities, such as that outrage perpetrated within the memory of many of us, how, on the insurrection of the Greeks at Scio, their barbarian masters carried fire and sword throughout the flourishing island, till it was left a desert, hurrying away women and boys to an infamous captivity, and murdering youths and grown men, till, out of 120,000 souls in the spring-time, not 900 were left them when the crops were ripe for the sickle.'[1]

The same writer reminds us of some particulars of facts which some persons among us seem bent upon forgetting or explaining away:—

* * * * * How, when the Ottomans added an infantry—I mean the Janissaries—to their Tartar horse, they formed that body of troops, from first to last, for near 500 years, of boys, all born Christians, a body of at first 12,000, at last 40,000 strong, torn away, year by year, from their parents, circumcised, trained, corrupted to the faith and morals of their masters, and becoming, in their turn, the instruments of the terrible policy of which they had themselves been the victims; and how when at length, lately, they abolished this work of their hands, they ended it by the slaughter of 20,000 of the poor renegades whom they had seduced from their God. I might remind you how, within the last few years, a Protestant traveller tells us that he found the Nestorian Christians, who had survived the massacre of their race, living in holes and pits, their pastures and tillage land forfeited, their sheep and cattle driven away, their villages burned, their ministers and people tortured; and how a Catholic missionary has found in the neighbourhood of Broussa the remnant of some

[1] Lectures on Hist. of Turks, pp. 135, 136.

Digitized by Google

twenty Catholic families, who, in consequence of repudiating the Turkish faith, had been carried all the way from Servia and Albania across the sea to Asia Minor; the men killed, the women disgraced, the boys sold, till out of 180 persons but 87 were left, and they sick, and famished, and dying amongst their unburied dead.'[1]

We have ventured to warn the reader against lending too implicit credence to the minor publications of the day. One exception, however, must be made on behalf of a traveller who, if not among our profoundest thinkers, is at least an independent one, and never writes otherwise than as a scholar, a gentleman, and a Christian. The 'Diary in Turkish and Greek Waters' is being so extensively read, and quoted in newspapers, that it is enough for us to mention it. To Lord Carlisle, then, we refer the reader for hints concerning the shocking state of morals in Turkey, 'such as, if fully known, would tend much to arrest the 'somewhat profuse flow of English sympathy for the Ottoman 'race;' the thorough corruption of officials, the incredible ignorance of the mass of the people, the incurable indolence, 'the deserted villages, uncultivated plains, banditti-haunted 'mountains, torpid laws, and disappearing people.'

Surely, not all the heroism of France and England can *ultimately* save a race like this. The ambition of Russia, the guile of Greece, may have prolonged their term of European existence, but can it be more than a prolongation? They may be saved from external enemies, but can they be saved from themselves? The Sultan (even a Turk, Lord Carlisle tells us, has suggested the possibility of such an event)—the Sultan might become a Christian. But what, we must ask, in this case, would his Asiatic subjects say? what all those other Mahometan tribes, who, being Sonnites, recognise in him the spiritual successor of Mahomet? And yet, without such a conversion (which we regard for the moment in a temporal and political point of view, apart from its higher import), how can the Turks in Europe become civilized, and how, if uncivilized, can they hope to retain their position? They, and they perhaps alone, among the proselytes of Mahometanism, have been constantly and solely the enemies, not of paganism, but of Christianity; they have brought out, not the better, but the worst features of the creed of Islam; they, for the last 800 years, have been troubling, and, whenever they dared, persecuting the Church of Christ; and they are reaping at length their sad and bitter reward. In their fatalistic book—in the Koran, they find it

[1] Lectures on Hist. of Turks, pp. 137, 138.

Digitized by Google

written: 'Each nation has its allotted period: when that period has arrived, men can neither hasten nor retard it.' That text of their self-styled prophet they may well be called upon to ponder now. But the Christian knows of righteous laws which, even upon earth, bring woe upon rebellious races; he knows of chastisements denounced upon unrelenting foes of the Lamb's Bride; he opens the Book of God's truly inspired Prophet, and reads: 'The nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, *those nations shall be utterly wasted.*'

Digitized by Google

ART. IV.—*Selections, Grave and Gay. By* THOS. DE QUINCEY. *From Writings published and unpublished.* Edinburgh: James Hogg.

AN autobiography, the subject of which still lives, presents some features of peculiar delicacy to the candid reviewer. It is easy, in the case of any other form of composition, to forget for the time that the writer has a private personal existence; for while we discuss the author we need never approach the man. But if that author builds his hopes of interesting us in *himself* as a person, it is evident that he lays himself open to another and more intolerable form of criticism, to strictures on the most intimate and sensitive parts of his nature,—what men can least bear to be touched and handled, except in the tenderest and most sympathising spirit. Fondly trusting to some particular grace and charm in the records of his own feelings and memories, he unconsciously, perhaps, incurs the risk of a rude shock to his sensibilities; and the critic is embarrassed by the fear of wounding, it may be, a heart, where he is only pursuing his vocation of passing judgment on what he has a right to consider an abstraction—a book.

It may be well then in the outset to state, that these curious, and in many parts interesting, volumes are, in spite of their real character, abstractions to us. We can recal the time when we regarded Mr. De Quincey and his 'Opium Eater,' as alike unrealities. In our childish ignorance, we never supposed these absorbing pages to be real genuine history, scenes actually passed through by flesh and blood, but a sort of grand dream-land; and the name of the writer, when it reached us, sounded in our ears just as feigned as the narrative. And though we are aware now of our mistake, the first impression remains undisturbed by any knowledge of the author or his history beyond what we learn from these pages; and all the vivid and most characteristic facts are still so dreamy—fading off on all sides into shadows—as happily still to sustain the original idea of unreality. We say *happily*, not that we have any very disagreeable things to discharge our conscience of, but as making our task easier and pleasanter to ourselves.

These volumes consist of autobiographical sketches, essays, and papers of a livelier strain;—the autobiographical part being of far the most value; and of that part, whatever concerns the author's childhood and early youth, the most attractive and original. The greater part of these were contributed to periodicals

Digitized by Google

many years since, but have been collected and added to by large interpolations for the present republication.

We see no reason to doubt Mr. De Quincey's recollections of his infancy; and if so, he relates facts of a more prematurely developed intellect than we can recollect to have found recorded elsewhere: so premature as to produce a painful impression. It is so evident that this precocity, this rapid growth of mind, this early maturity of the powers, all evident in the history of the author up to his sixteenth or eighteenth year, did leave a sort of blank. It was a promise that could not be fulfilled. The stage that succeeded so brilliant an opening brought the reaction of nervous bodily suffering, to which succeeded a weak and excessive indulgence in opium as a relief. This proved a most effective intellectual stimulant for a time, at the inevitable expense of impairing the mental powers, and of reducing what should be the mind's prime—the season of its most vigorous thought and action—to a period of mere retrospect; a time for dwelling upon, gathering up, amplifying the recollections of youth, its triumphs and its acquirements—but in which all original power is exhausted, the inventive faculty worn out, and what is worse, where the power of embracing the present, realizing its facts and throwing the mind into existing events or future contingencies, is lost. A diffusive rambling style is always fatiguing, but it is more painful when we regard it as a sign that the writer has no grasp of the subject that should engage him; that his mind is perpetually losing its hold of the point at issue, and slipping away into prolix disquisitions, the fruit of past thought; such untimely reminiscences showing that the past is more prominent to him than the present, and for ever pushing it out of its place. No display of learning, no appositeness in the recollection, can save these ramblings from an air of garrulity and failing power: and who is so great a rambler in this sense as Mr. De Quincey? to whom the present—*i. e.* the to-day, the work in hand, the current question whatever it may be—has but one prominent feature, as suggestive of the past—his past: his precocious observations, his youthful learning, his early visions, his experience of life; all having the additional remoteness that these acquirements were won at an age when others are yet children, with their course still before them, and their experience yet to learn.

These remarks apply only where the retrospect is an interference with the matter in hand. Where early recollections are the author's main subject, or vivid capricious impressions borrowed from childhood, and curiously influencing later opinions, as in 'The Opium Eater,' they are often more than commonly interesting. They form, indeed, in their right place, Mr. De

Digitized by Google

Quincey's most original contributions to the literature of his country. Nor does this discursiveness at all interfere with the literary merits of 'The English Opium Eater.' We see in it the natural fruit of the baneful habit, whose attractions and horrors he so powerfully describes; while the pomp of his style, its mystery and exaggeration, are eminently adapted for the pageantry of dreams, or dream-like scenes, gliding one into another, which make the power of that narrative. The strange minutely detailed history of an incident in his boyhood, (which, though true, sounds so improbable,) is a fit introduction for the concluding phantasmagoria.

Many of our readers may remember the impression of those sounding sentences on his young ear; a luxury seldom now enjoyed; for though little more than thirty years have passed since the 'Opium Eater' was written, the revolution in the art of writing has made the grand style a rarity, nor can we recal any author but Mr. Ruskin in our own immediate time, who indulges in it with success. This work does not form part of the volumes before us, yet we are tempted to quote a few sentences from it, to remind the forgetful ear of the pompous yet very effective music of some passages, though we know not how far they may lose their force, and appear extravagant, away from the context; not led up to, as they should be, by pages of gathering mystery and gloom. As an apology for the digression, we will call them, after the idea of their author, a kind of voluntary, appropriately introducing the reader to the mysterious infancy of which his first volume gives the portraiture. The first is a dream from 'The Pains of Opium:'—

'The dream commenced with a music which now I often heard in dreams —a music of preparation and of awakening suspense; a music like the opening of the Coronation Anthem, and which, like *that*, gave the feeling of a vast march—of infinite cavalcades filing off—and the tread of innumerable armies. The morning was come of a mighty day—a day of crisis and of final hope for human nature, then suffering some mysterious eclipse, and labouring in some dread extremity. Somewhere, I knew not where—somehow, I knew not how—by some beings, I knew not whom—a battle, a strife, an agony, was conducting,—was evolving like a great drama or piece of music; with which my sympathy was the more unsupportable from my confusion as to its place, its cause, its nature, and its possible issue. I, as is usual in dreams, (where of necessity we make ourselves central to every movement,) had the power, and yet had not the power, to decide it. I had the power, if I could raise myself to will it, and yet again had not the power, for the weight of twenty Atlantics was upon me, or the oppression of inexpiable guilt. "Deeper than ever plummet sounded," I lay inactive. Then, like a chorus, the passion deepened. Some greater interest was at stake; some mightier cause than ever yet the sword had pleaded or trumpet had proclaimed. Then came sudden alarms; hurryings to and fro; trepidations of innumerable fugitives, I knew not whether from the good cause or the bad: darkness and lights: tempests and human faces: and at last, with the sense that all was lost, female forms, and the features that

Digitized by Google

were worth all the world to me, and but a moment allowed, and clasped hands, and heart-breaking partings, and then—everlasting farewells! And with a sigh, such as the caves of hell sighed when the incestuous mother uttered the abhorred name of Death, the sound was reverberated—everlasting farewells! and again, and yet again reverberated—everlasting farewells! And I awoke in struggles and cried aloud—"I will sleep no more."' —'*The Pains of Opium*,' *London Magazine*, vol. iv. 1821, p. 377.

The next is an apostrophe, in somewhat pagan fashion, to this awful drug, in the conclusion of what he calls, 'The Pleasures of Opium:'—

'Oh! just, subtle, and mighty opium! that to the hearts of poor and rich alike, for the wounds that will never heal, and for "the pangs that tempt the spirit to rebel," bringest an assuaging balm; eloquent opium! that with thy potent rhetoric stealest away the purposes of wrath; and to the guilty man, for one night givest back the hopes of his youth, and hands washed pure from blood: and to the proud man, a brief oblivion for

"Wrongs unredress'd and insults unavenged:"

that summonest to the chancery of dreams, for the triumphs of suffering innocence, false witnesses; and confoundest perjury, and dost reverse the sentence of unrighteous judges:—thou buildest upon the bosom of darkness, out of the fantastic imagery of the brain, cities and temples, beyond the art of Phidias and Praxiteles—beyond the splendour of Babylon and Hekatompylos; and from the "anarchy of dreaming sleep," callest into sunny light the faces of long-buried beauties, and the blessed household countenances, cleansed from the "dishonours of the grave." Thou only givest these gifts to man; and thou hast the keys of Paradise, oh, just, subtle, and mighty Opium!'—*Ibid.* p. 361.

Sensations so vivid, depressions so awful, are at once a sequel and interpretation of a childhood and boyhood of morbid feeling and intellect. 'From my birth I was made an intellectual creature,' our author tells us, in the work we have just quoted from; 'and intellectual in the highest sense my pursuits and pleasures have been, even from my schoolboy days.'

The first autobiographical sketch introduces our author to us before the close of his sixth year, at which time 'the first chapter' of his life was already closed; and so great a shock of grief fallen upon him that 'life is finished' was the secret imagining of his heart, and he said to himself, 'Now is the blossoming of life withered for ever.' Let us not smile at this record of a child's grief, for we doubt not it is true, even to this sounding record of it; and before his sixth year this precocious child had won a large experience. Mr. De Quincey has distant recollections of a period before he could have reached the close of his second year. He 'recals a remarkable dream of terrific grandeur, concerning a favourite nurse,' and remembers to have connected at the same age, a profound sense of pathos with the reappearance, in very early spring, of some crocuses. We can read often in a young child's countenance the movements of thoughts like these, but to remember them is rare indeed. But

Digitized by Google

this is not so strange as his recollections connected with his first acquaintance with death; when a little sister died, he being at the time eighteen months old, 'more or less by some trifle,' but the date must be pretty closely ascertained. 'Death,' he says, 'was then scarcely intelligible to me; and I could not be so properly said to suffer sorrow as a sad perplexity.'

'With my sister Jane's death (though otherwise, as I have said, less sorrowful than perplexing), there was, however, connected an incident which made a most fearful impression upon myself, deepening my tendencies to thoughtfulness and abstraction beyond what would seem credible for my years. If there was one thing in this world from which, more than from any other, nature had forced me to revolt, it was brutality and violence. Now, a whisper arose in the family, that a female servant, who by accident was drawn off from her proper duties to attend my sister Jane for a day or two, had on one occasion treated her harshly, if not brutally; and as this ill-treatment happened within three or four days of her death, so that the occasion of it must have been some fretfulness in the poor child caused by her sufferings, naturally there was a sense of awe and indignation diffused through the family. I believe the story never reached my mother, and possibly it was exaggerated; but upon me the effect was terrific. I did not often see the person charged with this cruelty; but when I did, my eyes sought the ground; nor could I have borne to look her in the face; not, however, in any spirit that could be called anger. The feeling which fell upon me was a shuddering horror, as upon a first glimpse of the truth that I was in a world of evil and strife. Though born in a large town (the town of Manchester, even then among the largest of the island), I had passed the whole of my childhood, except for the few earliest weeks, in a rural seclusion. With three innocent little sisters for playmates, sleeping always amongst them, and shut up for ever in a silent garden from all knowledge of poverty, or oppression, or outrage, I had not suspected until this moment the true complexion of the world in which myself and my sisters were living. Henceforward the character of my thoughts changed greatly; for so *representative* are some acts, that one single case of the class is sufficient to throw open before you the whole theatre of possibilities in that direction. I never heard that the woman accused of this cruelty took it at all to heart, even after the event which so immediately succeeded had reflected upon it a more painful emphasis. But for myself, that incident had a lasting revolutionary power in colouring my estimate of life.'—*Autobiographic Sketches*, vol. i. pp. 7, 8.

The idea of a baby of a year and a-half 'suspecting the true complexion of the world in which it lives,' is somewhat alarming. We must suppose that the man adds a little definitiveness to the child's misgivings; but with every modification the recollection is a remarkable and genuine one. From all we can gather of the author's mother, she was not a woman to observe her children's minds with modern curiosity. She was a mother of her own day; the children lived a great deal in the nursery, and stood in awe of her. He somewhere says she always thought her own children below those of other people, and was evidently a disciplinarian, training her children to a Spartan simplicity of diet. Though he speaks respectfully of her,

Digitized by Google

describing her as a very religious person, an 'Evangelical,' and friend of Hannah More's, she did not make one of the leading characters of his own childhood, or help forward by any unwise fostering of her own, this extraordinary precocity.

The female influence of his infancy was his sister Elizabeth, three years older than himself, and it was her death which closed the first chapter of his life, in his sixth year, with the solemn words we have reported. This child shared in the family brilliancy of intellect. Her head was the wonder of phrenologists. He looks back on 'her serene and capacious mind.' She was his guide and companion; and thoughts, beyond what children think, were shared between them. In losing her, he describes himself as losing the only being to whom he was ever able to utter the feelings of his heart without reserve—'For I was 'the shyest of children; and at all stages of life, a natural sense 'of personal dignity held me back from exposing the least ray 'of feeling which I was not *wholly* encouraged to reveal.' To this shyness, no doubt, and to the loss of this sympathising hearer, the *public* now owes the unlimited confessions for which our author has chosen it for his confidant. This precious sister was taken ill suddenly,—

'In such circumstances, a child, as young as myself, feels no anxieties. Looking upon medical men as people privileged, and naturally commissioned, to make war upon pain and sickness, I never had a misgiving about the result. I grieved, indeed, that my sister should lie in bed; I grieved still more to hear her moan. But all this appeared to me no more than as a night of trouble, on which the dawn would soon arise. O! moment of darkness and delirium, when the elder nurse awakened me from that delusion, and launched God's thunderbolt at my heart in the assurance that my sister MUST die. Rightly it is said of utter, utter misery, that it "cannot be *remembered.*"[1] Itself, as a rememberable thing, is swallowed up in its own chaos. Blank anarchy and confusion of mind fell upon me. Deaf and blind I was, as I reeled under the revelation. I wish not to recall the circumstances of that time, when *my* agony was at its height, and hers, in another sense, was approaching. Enough it is to say, that all was soon over; and the morning of that day had at last arrived which looked down upon her innocent face, sleeping the sleep from which there is no awaking, and upon me sorrowing the sorrow for which there is no consolation.

'On the day after my sister's death, whilst the sweet temple of her brain was yet unviolated by human scrutiny, I formed my own scheme for seeing her once more. Not for the world would I have made this known, nor have suffered a witness to accompany me. I had never heard of feelings that take the name of "sentimental," nor dreamed of such a possibility. But grief, even in a child, hates the light, and shrinks from human eyes. The house was large enough to have two staircases; and by one of these I knew that about mid-day, when all would be quiet (for the servants dined at one o'clock), I could steal up into her chamber. I imagine that it was

[1] 'I stood in unimaginable trance
And agony, which cannot be remembered.'
Speech of Alhadra, in Coleridge's Remorse.

Digitized by Google

about an hour after high noon when I reached the chamber door; it was locked, but the key was not taken away. Entering, I closed the door so softly, that, although it opened upon a hall which ascended through all the storeys, no echo ran along the silent walls. Then, turning round, I sought my sister's face. But the bed had been moved, and the back was now turned towards myself. Nothing met my eyes but one large window, wide open, through which the sun of midsummer at mid-day was showering down torrents of splendour. The weather was dry, the sky was cloudless, the blue depths seemed the express types of infinity; and it was not possible for eye to behold, or for heart to conceive, any symbols more pathetic of life and the glory of life.'—Vol. i. pp. 11—13.

In the 'Opium Eater' there is a striking passage on the connexion of death with summer, and its greater terrors at that season. This sentiment is traceable to the moment described in this scene, where the glories of the season contrasted themselves so painfully to the young child's mind with the bleak of death. After following out the idea at greater length than we can quote, he continues,—

'Out of this digression, for the purpose of showing how inextricably my feelings and images of death were entangled with those of summer, as connected with Palestine and Jerusalem, let me come back to the bedchamber of my sister. From the gorgeous sunlight I turned round to the corpse. There lay the sweet childish figure; there the angel face; and, as people usually fancy, it was said in the house that no features had suffered any change. Had they not? The forehead, indeed—the serene and noble forehead—*that* might be the same; but the frozen eyelids, the darkness that seemed to steal from beneath them, the marble lips, the stiffening hands, laid palm to palm, as if repeating the supplications of closing anguish—could these be mistaken for life? Had it been so, wherefore did I not spring to those heavenly lips with tears and never-ending kisses? But so it was *not*. I stood checked for a moment; awe, not fear, fell upon me; and, whilst I stood, a solemn wind began to blow—the saddest that ear ever heard. It was a wind that might have swept the fields of mortality for a thousand centuries. Many times since, upon summer days, when the sun is about the hottest, I have remarked the same wind arising and uttering the same hollow, solemn, Memnonian, but saintly swell: it is in this world the one great *audible* symbol of eternity. And three times in my life have I happened to hear the same sound in the same circumstances—namely, when standing between an open window and a dead body on a summer day.

'Instantly, when my ear caught this vast Æolian intonation, when my eye filled with the golden fulness of life, the pomps of the heavens above, or the glory of the flowers below, and turning when it settled upon the frost which overspread my sister's face, instantly a trance fell upon me. A vault seemed to open in the zenith of the far blue sky, a shaft which ran up for ever. I, in spirit, rose as if on billows that also ran up the shaft for ever; and the billows seemed to pursue the throne of God; but *that* also ran before us and fled away continually. The flight and the pursuit seemed to go on for ever and ever. Frost gathering frost, some Sarsar wind of death, seemed to repel me; some mighty relation between God and death dimly struggled to evolve itself from the dreadful antagonism between them; shadowy meanings even yet continue to exercise and torment, in dreams, the deciphering oracle within me. I slept—for how long I cannot

Digitized by Google

say; slowly I recovered my self-possession; and, when I woke, found myself standing, as before, close to my sister's bed.

'I have reason to believe that a *very* long interval had elapsed during this wandering or suspension of my perfect mind. When I returned to myself, there was a foot (or I fancied so) on the stairs. I was alarmed; for, if anybody had detected me, means would have been taken to prevent my coming again. Hastily, therefore, I kissed the lips that I should kiss no more, and slunk, like a guilty thing, with stealthy steps from the room. Thus perished the vision, loveliest amongst all the shows which earth has revealed to me; thus mutilated was the parting which should have lasted for ever; tainted thus with fear was that farewell sacred to love and grief, to perfect love and to grief that could not be healed.'—Vol. i. pp. 15—18.

So early was our author's singlar faculty of trance-like dreams developed. It is his one intellectual peculiarity, wholly independent of the artificial stimulant to which it was afterwards attributed, though no doubt it was intensified by it. This gift might, on first thoughts, have been expected to lead to high poetic excellence, but we believe would rather be a bar to it, as holding back the child's mind, in its most impressible age, from seeing things as they are, and without any colouring from the individual mind, and so probably narrowing the range of thought. We are not speaking so much of this individual instance, under intense excitement, as of the general musing, dreamy tendency of his mind, which led him to fasten on certain congenial subjects, shaping them to his own fancy, at the expense of leaving the wider scene of general thought and observation unsought into. So morbid was his state after his sister's death, that he haunted solitary places in the hope of some visionary reunion. All nature suggested but one idea: the services of our Church,—for even then he was alive to the beauty of their tone and language,—ministered to it; while the fine architecture of the collegiate church at Manchester, which he then attended, and its painted windows, inspired trances and visions, and opened glimpses of heaven itself to his childish fancy. The result might have been most serious to mental health, but for a salutary break upon this luxury of grief, in the unwelcome arrival upon the scene of an elder brother, one of those vigorous and overbearing personages, that must make their presence felt on the most preoccupied mind, and will not suffer any shadows but of their own creating to interfere with their influence. So profound was the impression he made upon his little brother's mind, and so paramount was the authority he established over body, soul, and spirit, that the account of him, though leaving little room for the indulgence of Mr. De Quincey's peculiar vein, is one of his best efforts, and the humour almost the only genuine example of that quality his writings furnish. Some few qualities the brothers must have possessed in common, the same precocity of intellect,

Digitized by Google

the same power of realizing the fancies of the brain, and making them each his world, the same command of lofty, high-sounding diction,—but more points of contrast; for whereas the junior had been brought up in the society of girls, and was gentle, shy, retiring, a lover of solitude and peace and quiet above all things; his elder was endued with a two-fold boldness and audacity of nature; mind and body alike fearless, loving storm and contest; and of a prodigious, almost heroic confidence in himself, and contempt by consequence of all others; his little brother foremost of all. Some preliminaries of explanation are given before our author enters upon the scene. Mr. De Quincey, the father, was a wealthy merchant of the higher class, with aristocratic friendships beyond what is common with men of his order. His health for some years had been failing, and in the hope of restoring it he had travelled; wandering from country to country, with only occasional returns to England, when his wife would join him for a time, at the watering-place nearest his landing, but leaving the family, the younger members of it at least, at their country house, close upon Manchester. Thus it happened that our author scarcely ever knew his father, till he came home confessedly to die. He goes on then to account for having up to this time been equally a stranger to his brother,—

'My brother was a stranger from causes quite as little to be foreseen, but seeming quite as natural after they had really occurred. In an early stage of his career, he had been found wholly unmanageable. His genius for mischief amounted to inspiration; it was a divine *afflatus* which drove him in that direction; and such was his capacity for riding in whirlwinds and directing storms, that he made it his trade to create them, as a νεφελληγέρετα Ζεύς, a cloud-compelling Jove, in order that he *might* direct them. For this, and other reasons, he had been sent to the Grammar School of Louth, in Lincolnshire—one of those many old classic institutions which form the peculiar glory of England. To box, and to box under the severest restraint of honourable laws, was in those days a mere necessity of schoolboy life at *public* schools; and hence the superior manliness, generosity, and self-control, of those generally who had benefited by such discipline—so systematically hostile to all meanness, pusillanimity, or indirectness.'

* * * * * *

'Fresh from such a training as this, and at a time when his additional five or six years availed nearly to make *his* age the double of mine, my brother very naturally despised me; and, from his exceeding frankness, he took no pains to conceal that he did. Why should he? Who was it that could have a right to feel aggrieved by his contempt? Who, if not myself? But it happened, on the contrary, that I had a perfect craze for being despised. I doted on it; and considered contempt a sort of luxury that I was in continual fear of losing. Why not? Wherefore should any rational person shrink from contempt, if it happen to form the tenure by which he holds his repose in life?'—Vol. i. pp. 37, 38.

This resignation to a low place in the intellectual estimation of others is not without precedent. Children of a low, nervous

Digitized by Google

organization, are sometimes oppressed by the thought of the laborious life of learning and acting which they see stretched out before them; and, in contrast to children of more vigorous health, like to remain humble and helpless, putting off as long as they can the first step which is to lead to their being men and women—the hard workers of the world. But dear as his brother's contempt was in the abstract, and in principles of reason, there was sometimes 'an altitude—a starry altitude,' in the station of contempt assumed for him, which he owns sometimes nettled him; and he would imprudently betray some bookish accomplishment, not without the rash indulgence of a momentary triumph. However, though these displays shook his brother's judgment for a moment, it was formed on *à priori* arguments, that could not be overthrown by any demonstrations, and that seem to have had weight even in the innocent judgment of their victim:—

'The pillars of Hercules, upon which rested the vast edifice of his scorn, were these two—1st, my physics; he denounced me for effeminacy; 2d, he assumed, and even postulated as a *datum*, which I myself could never have the face to refuse, my general idiocy. Physically, therefore, and intellectually, he looked upon me as below notice; but, *morally*, he assured me that he would give me a written character of the very best description, whenever I chose to apply for it. "You're honest," he said; "you're willing, though lazy; you *would* pull, if you had the strength of a flea; and, though a monstrous coward, you don't run away." My own demurs to these harsh judgments were not so many as they might have been. The idiocy I confessed; because, though positive that I was not uniformly an idiot, I felt inclined to think that, in a majority of cases, I really *was;* and there were more reasons for thinking so than the reader is yet aware of. But, as to the effeminacy, I denied it *in toto;* and with good reason, as will be seen. Neither did my brother pretend to have any experimental proofs of it. The ground he went upon was a mere *à priori* one, viz. that I had always been tied to the apron-string of women or girls; which amounted at most to this—that, by training and the natural tendency of circumstances, I *ought* to be effeminate; that is, there was reason to expect beforehand that I *should* be so; but, then, the more merit in me, if, in spite of such reasonable presumptions, I really were *not*. In fact, my brother soon learned, by a daily experience, how entirely he might depend upon me for carrying out the most audacious of his own warlike plans: such plans, it is true, that I abominated; but *that* made no difference in the fidelity with which I tried to fulfil them.'—Vol. i. pp. 40, 41.

He next draws the portrait of this brother:—

'This eldest brother of mine was in all respects a remarkable boy. Haughty he was, aspiring, immeasurably active; fertile in resources as Robinson Crusoe; but also full of quarrel as it is possible to imagine; and, in default of any other opponent, he would have fastened a quarrel upon his own shadow for presuming to run before him when going westwards in the morning, whereas, in all reason, a shadow, like a dutiful child, ought to keep deferentially in the rear of that majestic substance which is the author of its existence. Books he detested, one and all, excepting only such as he happened to write himself. And these were not a few. On all subjects known to man, from the Thirty-nine Articles of our English

Digitized by Google

Church, down to pyrotechnics, legerdemain, magic, both black and white, thaumaturgy, and necromancy, he favoured the world (which world was the nursery where I lived amongst my sisters) with his select opinions. On this last subject especially—of necromancy—he was very great; witness his profound work, though but a fragment, and, unfortunately, long since departed to the bosom of Cinderella, entitled, "How to raise a Ghost; and when you've got him down, how to keep him down." '—Vol. i. pp. 37, 38.

We have not space to pursue this interesting question with our author; but from the report of his views and reasonings on the subject of ghosts, we see that this young necromancer could have ruled the spiritual world with a power, sense, and authority which would have put to shame the inane revelations from the world of spirits, which the American ghost-seers gravely publish with so much circumstance to the world; and which our readers have had a recent opportunity of perusing in the columns of the *Times;* where we see proved to demonstration how much less capacity is required than used to be supposed to make a conjuror. Our wiser schoolboy soon tired of his commerce with the unseen world, and turned his thoughts to science with equal ingenuity and success:—

'This hypothesis, however, like a thousand others, when it happened that they engaged no durable sympathy from his nursery audience, he did not pursue. For some time he turned his thoughts to philosophy, and read lectures to us every night upon some branch or other of physics. This undertaking arose upon some one of us envying or admiring flies for their power of walking upon the ceiling. "Pooh!" he said, "they are impostors; they pretend to do it, but they can't do it as it ought to be done. Ah! you should see *me* standing upright on the ceiling, with my head downwards for half an hour together, and meditating profoundly." My sister Mary remarked, that we should all be very glad to see him in that position. "If that's the case," he replied, "it's very well that all is ready, except as to a strap or two." Being an excellent skater, he had first imagined that, if held up until he had started, he might then, by taking a bold sweep ahead, keep himself in position through the continued impetus of skating. But this he found not to answer; because, as he observed, "the friction was too retarding from the plaster of Paris; but the case would be very different if the ceiling were coated with ice." As it was *not*, he changed his plan. The true secret, he now discovered, was this; he would consider himself in the light of a humming-top: he would make an apparatus (and he made it) for having himself launched, like a top, upon the ceiling, and regularly spun. Then the vertiginous motion of the human top would overpower the force of gravitation. He should, of course, spin upon his own axis, and sleep upon his own axis—perhaps he might even dream upon it; and he laughed at "those scoundrels, the flies," that never improved in their pretended art, nor made anything of it. The principle was now discovered; "and, of course," he said, "if a man can keep it up for five minutes, what's to hinder him from doing so for five months?" "Certainly, nothing that I can think off," was the reply of my sister, whose scepticism, in fact, had not settled upon the five months, but altogether upon the five minutes. The apparatus for spinning him, however, perhaps from its complexity, would not work: a fact evidently owing to the stupidity of the gardener. On re-considering the subject, he announced, to the disappointment of some amongst us, that, although the physical discovery was

Digitized by Google

now complete, he saw a moral difficulty. It was not a *humming*-top that was required, but a *peg*-top. Now, this, in order to keep up the *vertigo* at full stretch, without which, to a certainty, gravitation would prove too much for him, needed to be whipped incessantly. But that was precisely what a gentleman ought not to tolerate: to be scourged unintermittingly on the legs by any grub of a gardener, unless it were Father Adam himself, was a thing that he could not bring his mind to face.'—Vol. i. pp. 44, 45.

Who does not sympathise with such schoolroom recollections? Who so clever and brilliant as a clever schoolboy to a fit audience? such audience as every memory can supply, for surely each reader can recal some hero of fun as reckless as this, as full of resource, as boundless in assumption, as ready to cut every Gordian knot, as certain to secure the laugh and the last word against all odds. Such fit audience our elder brother had amongst his brothers and sisters; sisters, to banter and question, and excite to greater efforts of ingenuity, in spite of his insulting allusions to 'the most excruciatingly mean of capacities' to which he was condemned to lower his speculations; and brothers, to do his bidding with a servile deference. He gave lectures, and they listened to them; he wrote dramas, and they acted them. These were their peaceful pursuits, such was his quiet and domestic aspect. But it was in his character of warrior that he tormented the heart of his poor little brother, and it is the history of a long feud and daily battle with the boys of a Manchester manufactory, which is one of the most effective stories of these recollections. The writer still suffers from the remembrance of a war in which he was compelled to share, through the mere force of his brother's genius, who had established a thraldom over his reason and inner mind more oppressive than any bodily slavery, and under which he could hardly say that his soul was his own. As an instance of this mental bondage, each of these brothers had, after the fashion of Hartley Coleridge and many another boy, an imaginary kingdom, which one might suppose each would rule, after his own will, with undisputed sway. But not so; by dint of searching questions, the elder became possessed of every feature of his little brother's territory, and, henceforth, allowed his shadowy subjects no rest from his withering contempt and tyrannical aggressions.

'How, and to what extent,' my brother asked, 'did I raise taxes upon my subjects?' My first impulse was to say, that I did not tax them at all, for I had a perfect horror of doing so; but prudence would not allow of my saying *that*; because it was too probable he would demand to know how, in that case, I maintained a standing army; and if I once allowed it to be supposed that I had none, there was an end for ever to the independence of my people. Poor things! they would have been invaded and dragooned in a month. I took some days, therefore, to consider that point, but at last replied, that my people, being maritime, supported themselves mainly by

Digitized by Google

a herring fishery, from which I deducted a part of the produce, and afterwards sold it for manure to neighbouring nations. This last hint I borrowed from the conversation of a stranger who happened to dine one day at Greenhay, and mentioned that in Devonshire, or at least on the western coast of that county, near Ilfracombe, upon any excessive take of herrings beyond what the markets could absorb, the surplus was applied to the land as a valuable dressing. It might be inferred from this account, however, that the arts must be in a languishing state, amongst a people that did not understand the process of salting fish; and my brother observed derisively, much to my grief, that a wretched ichthyophagous people must make shocking soldiers, weak as water, and liable to be knocked over like nine-pins; whereas, in *his* army, not a man ever ate herrings, pilchards, mackerels, or, in fact, condescended to anything worse than sirloins of beef.

'At every step I had to contend for the honour and independence of my islanders; so that early I came to understand the weight of Shakspeare's sentiment—

"Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown!"

Oh, reader, do not laugh! I lived for ever under the terror of two separate wars in two separate worlds: one against the factory boys, in a real world of flesh and blood, of stones and brickbats, of flight and pursuit, that were anything but figurative; the other in a world purely aërial, where all the combats and the sufferings were absolute moonshine.'—Vol. i. pp. 77, 78.

The occasion of the *actual* warfare arose from their having to pass daily a manufactory, on their way from Greenhay, their mother's residence, to their tutor in Manchester:—

'The cause lay in our aristocratic dress. As children of an opulent family, where all provisions were liberal, and all appointments elegant, we were uniformly well-dressed; and, in particular, we wore trousers (at that time unheard of, except among sailors), and we also wore Hessian boots—a crime that could not be forgiven in the Lancashire of that day, because it expressed the double offence of being aristocratic and being outlandish. We were aristocrats, and it was vain to deny it; could we deny our boots? whilst our antagonists, if not absolutely *sansculottes*, were slovenly and forlorn in their dress, often unwashed, with hair totally neglected, and always covered with flakes of cotton. Jacobins they were not, as regarded any sympathy with the Jacobinism that then desolated France; for on the contrary, they detested everything French, and answered with brotherly signals to the cry of, 'Church and King,' or, 'King and Constitution.' But, for all that, as they were perfectly independent, getting very high wages, and these wages in a mode of industry that was then taking vast strides ahead, they contrived to reconcile this patriotic anti-Jacobinism with a personal Jacobinism of that sort which is native to the heart of man, who is by natural impulse (and not without a root of nobility, though also of base envy) impatient of inequality, and submits to it only through a sense of its necessity, or under a long experience of its benefits.

'It was on an early day of our new *tyrocinium*, or perhaps on the very first, that, as we passed the bridge, a boy happening to issue from the factory sang out to us derisively, "Holloa, Bucks!" In this the reader may fail to perceive any atrocious insult commensurate to the long war which followed. But the reader is wrong. The word "*dandies*," which was what the villain meant, had not then been born, so that he could not have called us by that name, unless through the spirit of prophecy. *Buck* was the nearest word

Digitized by Google

at hand in his Manchester vocabulary; he gave all he could, and let us dream the rest. But in the next moment he discovered our boots, and he consummated his crime by saluting us as "Boots! boots!" My brother made a dead stop, surveyed him with intense disdain, and bade him draw near, that he might 'give his flesh to the fowls of the air.' The boy declined to accept this liberal invitation, and conveyed his answer by a most contemptuous and plebeian gesture, upon which my brother drove him in with a shower of stones.

'During this inaugural flourish of hostilities, I, for my part, remained inactive, and therefore apparently neutral. But this was the last time that I did so: for the moment, indeed, I was taken by surprise. To be called a *buck* by one that had it in his choice to have called me a coward, a thief, or a murderer, struck me as a most pardonable offence; and as to *boots*, that rested upon a flagrant fact that could not be denied; so that at first I was green enough to regard the boy as very considerate and indulgent. But my brother soon rectified my views; or, if any doubts remained, he impressed me, at least, with a sense of my paramount duty to himself, which was threefold. First, it seems that I owed military allegiance to *him*, as my commander-in-chief, whenever we 'took the field;' secondly, by the law of nations, I, being a cadet of my house, owed suit and service to him who was its head; and he assured me that twice in a year, on *my* birthday and on *his*, he had a right, strictly speaking, to make me lie down, and to set his foot upon my neck; lastly, by a law not so rigorous, but valid amongst gentlemen—viz. 'by the *comity* of nations'—it seems I owed eternal deference, to one so much older than myself, so much wiser, stronger, braver, more beautiful, and more swift of foot.'—Vol. i. pp. 51—53.

The oppression of these acknowledged obligations was a burden on the cadet, to which he submitted without resistance, even in thought. He obeyed like a faithful vassal, leaving the responsibility to his chief, and gaining few of the honours of the war; being, indeed, frequently unjustly accused, in reports daily written in a gazette reporting the progress of the war, of 'horrible 'cowardice, even with a cowardice that seemed inexplicable, except 'on the supposition of treachery.' As they fought against numbers, the daily battle generally ended by our heroes running away, but not the less did the master spirit signalize assumed victories by appropriate triumphs and *Te Deums*. The junior, satisfying his scrupulous conscience by giving his view of the real state of the case, was not unwilling to join these ovations; for he loved chanting and Church music; and the pleasures of the campaign to him were all included in these musical triumphs; sung on his part, not without due solemnity; for his nature was grave, and resisted the burlesque, and a weight of awe and mystery brooded over him.

This scrupulousness led him into other difficulties; for in childhood he evidently began that habit of over-accuracy—a sort of hair-splitting nicety in the use and understanding of words, hedging them round with provisos, definitions, reservations, and analytical comments,—which so often disfigure Mr. De Quincey's style, and mar and fret away the interest of what he says. The

Digitized by Google

perspicacious elder brother manifested a characteristic impatience of these refinements and impertinent metaphysical subtleties, which he detected, and would have nipped in the bud. The narrative first explains that circumstances on both sides led to a tacit truce every morning; so that only on great days—a royal birthday, a victory, or the 5th of November—was the leader excited by the eagerness and joy of his spirit to any outbreak at that early hour; otherwise—

'Some natural growls we uttered, but hushed them soon, regardless

"Of the sweeping whirlpool's sway,
That, hush'd in grim repose, look'd for his evening prey."

'*That* came but too surely. Yes, evening never forgot to come; this odious necessity of fighting never missed its road back, or fell asleep, or loitered by the way, more than a bill of exchange, or a tertian fever. Five times a-week (Saturday sometimes, and Sunday always, were days of rest) the same scene rehearsed itself in pretty nearly the same succession of circumstances. Between four and five o'clock, we had crossed the bridge to the safe, or Greenhay side; then we paused, and waited for the enemy. Sooner or later a bell rang, and from the smoky hive issued the hornets that night and day stung incurably my peace of mind. The order and procession of the incidents after this were odiously monotonous. My brother occupied the main high road, precisely at the point where a very gentle rise of the ground attained its summit; for the bridge lay in a slight valley; and the main military position was fifty or eighty yards above the bridge; then—but having first examined my pockets, in order to be sure that my stock of ammunition, stones, fragments of slate, with a reasonable proportion of brickbats, was all correct and ready for action—he detached me about forty yards to the right, my orders being invariable, and liable to no doubts or "quibbling." Detestable in *my* ears was that word "*quibbling*," by which, for a thousand years, if the war had happened to last so long, he would have fastened upon me the imputation of meaning, or wishing, at least, to do what he called "pettifogulising"—that is, to plead some distinction, or verbal demur, in bar of my orders, under some colourable pretence that, according to their literal construction, they really did not admit of being fulfilled, or perhaps that they admitted it too much as being capable of fulfilment in two senses, either of them a practicable sense. True it was that my eye was preternaturally keen for flaws of language, not from pedantic exaction of superfluous accuracy, but, on the contrary, from too conscientious a wish to escape the mistakes which language not rigorous is apt to occasion. So far from seeking to "pettifogulise"—*i. e.* to find evasions for any purpose in a trickster's minute tortuosities of construction—exactly in the opposite direction, from mere excess of sincerity, most unwillingly I found, in almost everybody's words, an unintentional opening left for double interpretations. Undesigned equivocation prevails everywhere; and it is not the cavilling hair-splitter, but, on the contrary, the single-eyed servant of truth, that is most likely to insist upon the limitation of expressions too wide or too vague, and upon the decisive election between meanings potentially double. Not in order to resist or evade my brother's directions, but for the very opposite purpose—viz. that I might fulfil them to the letter; thus and no otherwise it happened that I showed so much scrupulosity about the exact value and position of his words, as finally to draw upon myself the vexatious reproach of being habitually a "pettifoguliser."'—Vol. i. pp. 60—62.

Digitized by Google

But we must not linger over this spirited campaign, though the details of its triumphs and reverses are all entertaining and well told. The author needs, indeed, a strong personal concern in all that he has to describe, to keep the analyzing, metaphysical propensity within bounds; then, be the subject important or trivial, he writes vigorously, and to the point; or, rather, we should say, that no subject of personal concern, however slight, is trivial to him, but deserving and exciting his best efforts. A merely general interest has not, as far as we see, a sufficient hold on his sympathies to keep him steadily to work; the mind will fly off in search of some link connecting the matter in hand with his own personal idiosyncrasy. Wherever he has to describe what he has himself acted or suffered, this habit either is not called into exercise, or it seems more in place; the attention is all alive, and a peculiarly retentive memory keeps every scene in which his heart has ever been interested as vividly distinct as though it were a picture presented to the bodily eye. This memory must indeed be a remarkable quality; a power that we hardly know whether to envy, or to respect in contented inferiority; as doubting whether the constant possession of all the mind has ever dwelt upon would be felt a blessing; for elsewhere he tells us he was able to quote, and does quote, long passages from the 'Prelude,' while it was yet in MS., which he had not seen or heard for twenty years.

The war came to an end through the accidental presence of one of their four guardians on the scene of action: he caused the boys to change their hour of attending their tutor; and thus the two years' feud was brought to an abrupt close. Not long after, the elder brother, who had manifested an extraordinary talent for drawing, was dedicated to that pursuit, and made a pupil of De Loutherbourgh, with the enormous fee of a thousand guineas. The close of the poor boy's bright opening into life is sad enough. Before the conclusion of his sixteenth year he died of typhus fever; his little brother never saw him again. Not that this event is recorded with much profession of sorrow. The bondage of spirit had been apparently too galling for the growth of affection, though we have no records of personal tyranny; and the absolute impossibility that these uncongenial scenes could ever recur again was evidently felt as a relief.

How keenly he had felt them—with what a sense of the evils of war and division—is somewhat pathetically expressed; and awakes our sympathies for the philosophical, thoughtful child, compelled to act so long against his nature. He has described, with much humour, a kindly rescue effected on his behalf by some of the factory girls, who had saved him from the vengeance of their brothers:—

Digitized by Google

'It saddened me, besides, to find myself under the political necessity of numbering amongst the Philistines, and as daughters of Gath, so many kind-hearted girls, whom, by personal proof, I knew to be such. In the profoundest sense I was unhappy; and not from any momentary accident of distress, but from deep glimpses which now, and heretofore, had opened themselves, as occasions arose, into the inevitable conflicts of life. One of the saddest among such conflicts is the necessity, wheresoever it occurs, of adopting—though the heart should disown—the enmities of one's own family, or country, or religious sect. In forms how afflicting must that necessity have sometimes occurred during the Parliamentary war!'—Vol. i. pp. 67, 68.

These same thoughts, with the same illustrations from our civil wars, haunted his dreams in after life, and form one of the spectacles of the 'Opium Eater.' Unquestionably the continual sense of subjection is against the formation of tenderer ties; so we do not wonder at the composure of tone with which this hectoring brother, William, is dismissed from the scene.

'The advantages, indeed, which my brother had over me in years, in physical activities of every kind, in decision of purpose, and in energy of will—all which advantages, besides, borrowed a ratification from an obscure sense, on my part, of duty as incident to what seemed an appointment of Providence—inevitably *had* controlled, and for years to come *would have* controlled, the free spontaneous movements of a contemplative dreamer like myself. Consequently, this separation, which proved an eternal one, and contributed to deepen my constitutional propensity to gloomy meditation, had for me (partly on that account, but much more through the sudden birth of perfect independence which so unexpectedly it opened) the value of a revolutionary experience. A new date, a new starting-point, a redemption (as it might be called) into the golden sleep of halcyon quiet, after everlasting storms, suddenly dawned upon me; and, not as any casual intercalation of holidays that would come to an end—but, for anything that appeared to the contrary, as the perpetual tenor of my future career.'—Vol. i. pp. 107, 108.

Soon after this, in his twelfth year, our author was sent for the first time to a public school, *i.e.* the grammar-school at Bath, where his early skill in Latin verse won him the commendations of the master, and the displeasure of the head boys, to whom this little fellow was somewhat injudiciously set up as a better scholar than themselves. Not that he has much to complain of from their vengeance: all his sympathies are with public schools, and many opportunities are taken to enlarge on their superiority over private ones,—and he had experience of both. Though at first backward in Greek, we learn elsewhere that he presently acquired extraordinary facility and power of conversing in it. It is in the 'Opium Eater' that he mentions his master pointing him out to a friend, with the words, 'That boy could harangue an Athenian mob better than you and I could an English one.' His retentive memory, ready apprehension, and passionate love of learning, all developed about this time, had caused his mind to expand in what

Digitized by Google

we must think an unhealthy degree. Circumstances, too, were unfavourable for the best education for a boy of his very remarkable promise. He had no father; his four guardians seem ill to have supplied the place of one; and he evidently thinks his mother erred on the unusual side of austerity. He left the school at Bath on occasion of an affection of the head, which kept him at home for a year; and at the end of that time, without sufficient reason, as it seems, unless it were that mother thought him unduly flattered there,—and to the great disappointment of his late masters,—he was removed to a private school, the head of which he felt to be not so good a scholar as himself.

Thus far to his fifteenth year, when a further change occurred still less favourable to his best interests. He heads this chapter with the words, 'I enter the World.' It seems strange that a woman evidently so jealous of the effects of praise and school-success on her son's mind, and who subsequently was disposed, in conjunction with his guardians, to exercise an almost stern authority over him, should on this occasion give her consent to a change of scene and life, which manifestly must unfit him for the restraints of school, to which they afterwards compelled him. It can only have been the temptation which was now offered to her avowedly aristocratic predilections. A young friend of his own age, Lord Westport, son of Lord Altamont, a friend of his father's, invited him at this time to accompany him to Ireland, there to spend the summer and autumn with him; an invitation which his mother allowed him to accept. And here follows a very brilliant season of enjoyment for a schoolboy of fourteen. He immediately found himself his own master, and thrown into the best society, which he was fully calculated to enjoy, and, considering his youth, to shine in. He joined his friend at Eton, and stayed time enough there to form aristocratic acquaintances amongst the boys, and to receive some civilities from royalty itself; for his friend, as a grandson of Lord Howe, was much noticed by the king, and our author was on one or two occasions, as his chosen companion, invited with him. He records a conversation with George the Third, in which he seems to have behaved with more than boyish sense and tact, and afterwards was invited with his friend to a ball at the Castle. His account of this scene is illustrative of his speculative vein, which was even now working in him, as, indeed, was *every* subsequent view and thought, weighty or trivial. His principles were æsthetic; he saw a philosophy in scenes, splendours, and spectacles, and was not easy till he could *account* for the pleasures his eyes received, and trace them to their causes. The art of dancing is not often, in our modern days, treated with so high and solemn a respect as we here find it. We ourselves think his theory about country-

Digitized by Google

dances a useful one. People will dance, and we believe that dancing might be made a higher and more estimable pleasure than it is in these polking, whirling days; Sir John Davies' 'Orchestra' elevates the performance into a high rank among supersensual things; it is therefore that in these serious pages we venture on a long and characteristic extract.

'The invitation was, of course, on my friend's account; but her majesty had condescended to direct that I, as his visitor, should be specially included. Lord Westport, young as he was, had become tolerably indifferent about such things; but to me such a scene was a novelty; and, on that account, it was settled we should go as early as was permissible. We *did* go: and I was not sorry to have had the gratification of witnessing (if it were but for once or twice) the splendours of a royal party. But, after the first edge of expectation was taken off, after the vague uncertainties of rustic ignorance had given place to absolute realities, and the eye had become a little familiar with the flashing of the jewellery, I began to suffer under the constraints incident to a young person in such a situation—the situation, namely, of sedentary passiveness, where one is acted upon, but does not act. The music, in fact, was all that continued to delight me; and, but for *that*, I believe, I should have had some difficulty in avoiding so monstrous an indecorum as yawning. I revise this faulty expression, however, on the spot: not the music only it was, but the music combined with the dancing, that so deeply impressed me. The ball-room—a temporary erection, with something of the character of a pavilion about it—wore an elegant and festal air; the part allotted to the dancers being fenced off by a gilded lattice-work, and ornamented beautifully from the upper part with drooping festoons of flowers. But all the luxury that spoke to the eye merely, faded at once by the side of impassioned dancing, sustained by impassioned music. Of all the scenes which this world offers, none is to me so profoundly interesting, none (I say it deliberately) so affecting, as the spectacle of men and women floating through the mazes of a dance; under these conditions, however, that the music shall be rich, resonant, and festal, the execution of the dancers perfect, and the dance itself of a character to admit of free, fluent, and *continuous* motion. But this last condition will be sought vainly in the quadrilles, &c., which have for so many years banished the truly beautiful *country-dances* native to England. Those whose taste and sensibility were so defective as to substitute for the *beautiful* in dancing the merely *difficult*, were sure, in the end, to transfer the depravations of this art from the opera-house to the floors of private ball-rooms. The tendencies even then were in that direction; but as yet they had not attained their final stage: and the English country-dance was still in estimation at the courts of princes. Now, of all dances, this is the only one, as a class, of which you can truly describe the motion to be *continuous*, that is, not interrupted or fitful, but unfolding its fine mazes with the equability of light in its diffusion through free space. And wherever the music happens to be not of a light, trivial character, but charged with the spirit of festal pleasure, and the performers in the dance so far skilful as to betray no awkwardness verging on the ludicrous, I believe that many people feel as I feel in such circumstances, viz. derive from the spectacle the very grandest form of passionate sadness which can belong to any spectacle whatsoever. *Sadness* is not the exact word; nor is there *any* word in any language (because none in the finest languages) which exactly expresses the state; since it is not a depressing, but a most elevating state to which I allude.'

* * * * * *

Digitized by Google

' 'From all which the reader may comprehend, if he should not happen experimentally to have felt, that a spectacle of young men and women, *flowing* through the mazes of an intricate dance under a full volume of music, taken with all the circumstantial adjuncts of such a scene in rich men's halls; the blaze of lights and jewels, the life, the motion, the sea-like undulation of heads, the interweaving of the figures, the ἀναπύκλωσις or self-revolving, both of the dance and the music, "never ending, still beginning," and the continual regeneration of order from a system of motions which for ever touch the very brink of confusion; that such a spectacle, with such circumstances, may happen to be capable of exciting and sustaining the very grandest emotions of philosophic melancholy to which the human spirit is open. The reason is, in part, that such a scene presents a sort of mask of human life, with its whole equipage of pomps and glories, its luxury of sight and sound, its hours of golden youth, and the interminable revolution of ages hurrying after ages, and one generation treading upon the flying footsteps of another; whilst all the while the overruling music attempers the mind to the spectacle, the subject to the object, the beholder to the vision.'—Vol. i. pp. 205, 206.

A chapter headed, 'The Nation of London,' is a curious specimen of our author's powers of digression. All people of any literary name are expected, if they see London for the first time after they have reached a thinking age, to have something pointed and emphatic to say about it. It must have been on this principle that Mr. De Quincey undertook his task of recording his first impressions; but finding that his impressions of London were really nothing at all—that in fact there was no opportunity of forming any—he uses the occasion for an indulgence in absolute discursiveness, not without passages of deep thought, nor unamusing as a specimen of our author's manner, so soon as we find that nothing is to be learnt on the subject proposed. Forty closely printed pages are spent on this nominal topic; the first, legitimately enough, on describing the roads and the traffic which lead up to this great centre; only these the boys did not see,—as, to avoid dust, they posted in bye-ways. However, they got into the Edgeware-road, and were locked once or twice in a stream of carriages. 'What had they come for?' he asks; 'to see London?' But for this task only three hours and a-half were allowed, as they had appointed to dine at Porters, the seat of Lord Westport's grandfather, that same evening. Here then is a tangent from which to fly off. The proportion of *time* to the things to be seen within that time, is suggestive of disproportions generally. Three times, our author tells us, he had had his taste, *i.e.* his sense of proportions, memorably outraged. It is of course in keeping with a mind like his, that these similar outrages should have as little relation as possible in all common judgments with the disproportion under question. The first instance, then, is when he saw a painting of Cape Horn, 'which seemed almost 'treasonably below its rank and office in this world—as the ter-'minal abutment of our mightiest continent.' How ashamed we

Digitized by Google

'should be if that Cape should ever be seen from the moon.' At this sally he glances off to relate how a party of Englishmen, ascending Mount Etna to see the sun rise, were so disgusted at the failure of splendour in this luminary, that they unanimously hissed him—with apologetic explanations from our author excusing the sun for his shortcomings. The next example is the final ceremonial valediction of Garrick from *his* stage, wherein professing to take leave of the world, he could only say farewell to an audience—the author branching off here into comparisons of the size of Drury Lane and the Circus Maximus. The last disproportion is this necessity of seeing London in three hours. The boys very sensibly decide upon either S. Paul's or Westminster Abbey, to be seen as a representative of London, and to determine the doubtful point, they toss up. *Heads* come up for the Abbey, but as each proves to have a preference for the other, they try again, and then *heads* were the Cathedral. But here that one touch of nature which makes the whole world kin occurs. The *fees* naturally offended these young sightseers: they were disgusted by applications for twopences. The subject is suggestive, and we say farewell to S. Paul's: for fees at churches and public buildings remind the author of other restrictions, more oppressive than fees, in public libraries, and these occupy three pages, enriched by a long note on the subject of copyright. It is time now to leave London, if their dinner appointment is to be kept. They arrive in time, and meet at dinner a Lord Morton, who had once been engaged to a lady who had had an extraordinary presentiment of her premature death; and the story is told at length. This Lord Morton distinguished our author by particular compliments on a certain prize copy of Latin verses, which had taken the third place, and was deserving in his lordship's opinion of the first. This kindness is acknowledged at great length, going into the question of the author's amount of value for intellectual distinction, and his just opinion, that with his degree of talent, he might have made a poet for his own day, but not the more genuine poet of all time; with some very just remarks on poetry in general. They return now to Eton, and attend the Royal ball, of which we have already given the description in part. It ends by a long digressive facetious account of the schoolboy language 'Ziph,' in which he and his companion conversed on this occasion, tracing it up to Nineveh, and involving an anecdote of fagging at Winchester, in which some boys were nightly compelled to traverse the sewers of that ancient city, to the injury of their health. Soon after the young travellers left Eton for Ireland, passing through Wales, the scenery of which is criticised with considerable discernment. There their tutor suddenly left them, under some unexplained pique. This, as a mystery, reminds Mr. De Quincey of other mysteries totally

Digitized by Google

irrelevant, of which he gives the history with comments and moral. Next the voyage is described, and at length they arrive at Dublin. This resumé, under the head of seeing 'London,' is given as a specimen of the intellectual effort exacted very frequently from Mr. De Quincey's readers. They can never be sure of their ground, nor can hope for a moment's repose on any one subject. The consequences on the attention are often fatal. The faculty of wandering is one very easily imparted by a writer to his readers, only we find ourselves preferring our own wanderings to our author's—and fairly come to a stand, though we are willing to acknowledge that he has a good deal to say that we should be glad to read, if only it could be set forth with something like method, not in a disorder which quite damps and palls the intellectual appetite. Yet this is a vain wish—a prosy discursive habit of mind, has a deeper root of evil than mere want of method. There is too often a love of display in it, a small vanity for parading stores of knowledge and memory, which deprives the mind of vigour and power to pursue a train of connected thought. One thing, such writers and talkers seem to have more at heart than the elucidation of their subject, and that is the exhibition of themselves. Yet these sound harsh judgments, when we find our author conscious of his own habit of mind, as in the following passage:—

'My last two chapters, very slenderly connected with Birmingham, are yet made to rise out of it; the one out of Birmingham's own relation to the topic concerned (viz. *Travelling*), and the other (viz. *my Brother*) out of its relation to all possible times in my earlier life, and therefore, why not to all possible places? *Anywhere* introduced, the chapter was partially out of its place; as well then to introduce it in Birmingham as elsewhere. Somewhat arbitrary episodes, therefore, are these two last chapters; yet still endurable as occurring in a work confessedly rambling, and whose very duty lies in the pleasant paths of vagrancy. Pretending only to amuse my reader, or pretending chiefly to *that*, however much I may have sought, or *shall* seek, to interest him occasionally through his profounder affections, I enjoy a privilege of neglecting harsher logic, and connecting the separate sections of these sketches, not by ropes and cables, but by threads of aërial gossamer.'—Vol. i. p. 350.

It is a mistake at any rate, if nothing worse, to suppose this deliberate habit of digression agreeable. The English mind is impatient at anything so unbusiness-like. We do not wonder, therefore, to find that Mr. De Quincey refers to America as the country to which he looks for sympathy, and which first appreciated, and called for a collection and reprint of his scattered papers. So frightful a prolixity penetrates and pervades the literature of that country, so audacious are the claims of its authors upon the time and attention of their readers, that by comparison Mr. De Quincey might seem reasonable in his demands. Practice may have made American readers so skilful in gathering the precious ore of thought from out of the débris amongst

Digitized by Google

which it lies scattered, that they may have become unconscious of the labour. Certain it is that our author's preface alludes to much flattering comment and criticism reaching him, through private means, from his transatlantic readers.

It might have been well to introduce earlier some dates into our sketch. They occur but seldom in the book itself; but we gather that our author was born about the year 1786; that his visit to Dublin took place in 1800, two years after the rebellion, of which he gives the history at length—as he heard it constantly described in general society there; that thirty-three years after this time the majority of these papers were written; and added to subsequently, first for the American edition, published probably in 1848, and finally for the present republication; at which time we conclude the author to be approaching his seventieth year. The 'English Opium Eater' appeared in the 'London Magazine' in 1821, before these wandering habits had gained their present mastery.

But to return now from the author, with his mature faults, to the gifted boy of fourteen or fifteen. No longer, however, a boy at that age, but prematurely a man: as he himself explains, on the occasion of the first dawn of love and reverence for the gentler sex first irradiating his mind. The history of this event is curious, as showing the morbid condition of a mind so unfortunately in advance of its age, and probably subject to an acute dread of ridicule. The scene is the deck of an Irish passage-boat, on which he and his young friend were returning from a visit to some noble family at a distance from Dublin. On board was a lady (with her family of daughters), described as an awful personage, a wit, a blue-stocking, a leader of ton in Dublin. Attracted by the intelligence that a young lord was on deck, she left her retirement in the cabin; and ascertaining from the French valet the title and condition of the two young travellers, she applied herself sedulously to flatter the lord, and to humble his companion, whom she chose to regard as a toad-eater. All this sounds improbable enough, but certain it is that the youth so took it, and struggled in vain against the fire of her wit and sarcasm, magnifying the incident into one of the turning points of his life.

'The narrow bounds of our deck made it not easy to get beyond talking-range; and thus it happened, that for two hours I stood the worst of this bright lady's feud. At length the tables turned. Two ladies appeared slowly ascending from the cabin, both in deepest mourning, but else as different in aspect as summer and winter. The elder was the Countess of Errol, then mourning an affliction which had laid her life desolate, and admitted of no human consolation.'

* * * * * *

'The younger lady, on the other hand, who was Lady Errol's sister,—— Heavens! what a spirit of joy and festal pleasure radiated from her eyes, her step, her voice, her manner! She was Irish, and the very impersona-

Digitized by Google

tion of innocent gaiety, such as we find oftener, perhaps, amongst Irish women than those of any other country. Mourning, I have said, she wore; from sisterly consideration, the deepest mourning; that sole expression there was about her of gloom or solemn feeling—

> "But all things else about her drawn
> From May-time and the cheerful dawn."

Odious blue-stocking of Belfast and Dublin! as some would call you, how I hated you up to that moment! half an hour after, how grateful I felt for the hostility which had procured me such an alliance. One minute sufficed to put the quick-witted young Irishwoman in possession of our little drama, and the several parts we were playing. To look was to understand, to wish was to execute, with this ardent child of nature. Like Spenser's Bradamant, with martial scorn she couched her lance on the side of the party suffering wrong. Her rank, as sister-in-law to the Constable of Scotland, gave her some advantage for winning a favourable audience; and throwing her ægis over me, she extended that benefit to myself. Road was now made perforce for me also; my replies were no longer stifled in noise and laughter. Personalities were banished; literature was extensively discussed; and that is a subject which, offering little room to argument, offers the widest to eloquent display. I had immense reading; vast command of words, which somewhat diminished as ideas and doubts multiplied; and, speaking no longer to a deaf audience, but to a generous and indulgent protectress, I threw out, as from a cornucopia, my illustrative details and recollections; trivial enough, perhaps, as I might now think, but the more intelligible to my present circle. It might seem too much the case of a storm in a slop-basin, if I were to spend any words upon the revolution which ensued. Suffice it, that I remained the lion of that company which had previously been most insultingly facetious at my expense; and the intellectual lady finally declared the air of the deck unpleasant.'—Vol. i. pp. 356—360.

The sensations consequent on this event he calls a 'revolution;' not that he fell in love with the lady herself, but henceforth with the ideal of womanhood.

'It fixed a great era of change in my life; and this new-born idea, being agreeable to the uniform tendencies of my own nature—that is, lofty and aspiring—it governed my life with great power, and with most salutary effects.'—Vol. i. p. 361.

Ladies were destined thus prematurely to influence his character, for on parting with Lord Westport, he now joined his sister at Laxton, the seat of Lord Carbery, on a visit to his mother's friend, Lady Carbery, a beautiful woman whom he had known from his infancy, while she was yet a girl of remarkable talent and of a character which made her, in his eyes, a worthy successor of Jeremy Taylor's patroness of that name. The fates were certainly against our young gentleman keeping his head, and if there are suspicions of vanity attached to later life, how can we wonder when the seeds were so industriously sown in his youth? His hostess' first act on his arrival, was to draw him aside and beg him, in the absence of her husband, to entertain and draw out her only other male guest, Lord Massey, who, with his wife, was on a visit there. The pair are designated Cymon and Iphigenia.

Digitized by Google

'And yet, for a service of that nature, could she reasonably rely upon me? Odious is the hobble-de-hoy to the mature young man. Generally speaking, that cannot be denied. But in me, though naturally the shyest of human beings, intense commerce with men of every rank, from the highest to the lowest, had availed to dissipate all arrears of *mauvaise honte;* I could talk upon innumerable subjects; and, as the readiest means of entering immediately upon business, I was fresh from Ireland—knew multitudes of those whom Lord Massey either knew or felt an interest in —and, at that happy period of life, found it easy, with three or four glasses of wine, to call back the golden spirits which were now so often deserting me. Renovated, meantime, by a hot bath, I was ready, at the second summons of the dinner-bell, and descended a new creature to the drawing-room. Here I was presented to the noble lord and his wife. Lord Massey was in figure shortish, but broad and stout, and wore an amiable expression of face. That I could execute Lady Carbery's commission, I felt satisfied at once. And, accordingly, when the ladies had retired from the dining-room, I found an easy opening, in various circumstances connected with the Laxton stables, for introducing naturally a picturesque and contrasting sketch of the stud and the stables at Westport.'—Vol. ii. p. 4.

To us, who cannot witness the grace which it is implied made all this easy and natural, it all sounds rather insufferable, though we doubt after all, whether he was quite the puppy his maturer self takes pride in depicting. Lord Massey must, however, have been a good-natured nobleman to endure the condescension of this young genius, so skilled in adapting his conversation to the level of his capacity.

'Horses had formed the natural and introductory topic of conversation between us. What we severally knew of Ireland, though in different quarters—what we both knew of Laxton, the barbaric splendour and the civilized splendour, had naturally an interest for us both in their contrasts (at one time so picturesque, at another so grotesque), which illuminated our separate recollections. But my quick instinct soon made me aware that a jealousy was gathering in Lord Massey's mind around such a topic, as though too ostentatiously levelled to his particular knowledge, or to his *animal* condition of taste. But easily I slipped off into another key. At Laxton, it happened that the library was excellent. Founded by whom, I never heard: but certainly, when used by a systematic reader, it showed itself to have been systematically collected; it stretched pretty equably through two centuries, viz. from about 1600 to 1800, and might perhaps amount to 17,000 volumes. Lord Massey was far from illiterate; and his interest in books was unaffected, if limited, and too often interrupted by defective knowledge.'—Vol. ii. pp. 11, 12.

Lord Massey was shy, and, as an Irishman of defective education, was afraid of English society; his young friend's knowledge of the world thus combated these fears:—

'In vain I suggested to him that most of what passed amongst foreigners and amongst Irishmen for English *hauteur* was pure reserve, which, among all people that were bound over by the inevitable restraints of their rank (imposing, it must be remembered, jealous duties as well as privileges), was sure to become the operative feeling. I contended, that in the English situation there was no escaping this English reserve, except by great impudence and defective sensibility; and that, if examined, reserve was

Digitized by Google

the truest expression of respect towards those who were its objects.'—Vol. ii. p. 20.

But his cares were not confined to Lord Massey, Lady Carbery, gifted and highly educated, made him her tutor and adviser on the most momentous subjects.

'To cultivate religious knowledge in an intellectual way, she very well understood that she must study divinity. And she relied upon me for assisting her. Not that she made the mistake of ascribing to me any knowledge on that subject; but I could learn; and whatsoever I *had* learned, she knew, by experience, that I could make abundantly plain to her understanding. Wherever I did *not* understand, I was far too sincere to dissemble that fact. Where I *did* understand, I could enable *her* to understand.

'On the subject of theology, it was not easy indeed for anybody, man or boy, to be more ignorant than myself. My studies in that field had been none at all. Nor was this any subject for wonder, or (considering my age) for blame. In reality, to make theology into a captivating study for the young, it must be translated into a controversial theology.'

* * * * * *

'But, whilst I was ignorant of theology, as a direct and separate branch of study, the points are so many at which theology inosculates with philosophy, and with endless casual and random suggestions of the self-prompted reason, that inevitably from that same moment in which I began to find a motive for directing my thoughts to this new subject, I wanted not something to say that might have perplexed an antagonist, or (in default of such a vicious associate) that might have amused a friend, more especially a friend so predisposed to a high estimate of myself as Lady Carbery. Sometimes I did more than amuse her: I startled her, and I even startled myself, with distinctions that to this hour strike me as profoundly just, and as undeniably novel.'—Vol. ii. pp. 44—46.

We need not go into these difficulties, though they occupy many pages, leading us to a disquisition whether they were original or not: and though found in the books of philosophers, he satisfies himself justly that they were so in him, as he had had no opportunity of reading the said philosophers. The young instructor soon pronounced that nobody could be a theologian without a knowledge of Greek, which Lady Carbery must learn as a preliminary; and she very soon did attain, under his tutorship, a power of reading the Greek Testament.

No wonder that under such a stimulus he writes:—

'To teach is to learn: according to an old experience, it is the very best mode of learning—the surest and the shortest. And hence, perhaps, it may be, that in the middle ages by the monkish word *scholaris* was meant indifferently he that learned and he that taught. Never in any equal number of months had my understanding so much expanded as during this visit to Laxton. The incessant demand made upon me by Lady Carbery for solutions of the many difficulties besetting the study of divinity and the Greek Testament, or for such approximations to solutions as my resources would furnish, forced me into a preternatural tension of all the faculties applicable to that purpose. Lady Carbery insisted upon calling me her "Admirable Crichton;" and it was in vain that I demurred to this honorary title upon two grounds—first, as being one towards which I had no natural

Digitized by Google

aptitudes or predisposing advantages; secondly (which made her stare), as carrying with it no real or enviable distinction.'—Vol. ii. p. 58.

Can we wonder after this intoxicating life—after six months constant converse with grown men, during his visit to Ireland, frequently upon topics of the gravest order, and after this more delightful intercourse as the chosen friend and tutor of a distinguished lady, that a return to school-life should appear distasteful to our young hero? He remonstrated, reasoned, argued with his mother and his guardians in vain. It was decided that as his patrimony was small (150*l.* a-year), it would be desirable for him to try for one of the exhibitions of Manchester Grammar-school; and thither he went, with a reluctance, disdain and abhorrence of his position which may be imagined. An unlooked-for alleviation of its miseries, however, occurred at first. A strange course of events brought Lady Carbery herself to Manchester for six months, and an arrangement was made that he should spend every evening at her house. While this lasted, he found life endurable; but on her departure he put into practice his long-formed resolution, and ran away. Not that this independent step was thus vulgarly designated in the 'Opium Eater,' where it is to be found narrated at full length, and with a great deal of impressive language; but so it was. The miseries which followed upon his flight, hunger approaching to starvation, and which laid the seeds of that complaint for which he had recourse to opium as an alleviation; the strange companionship he formed in his sad rambles for weeks and months in London, moneyless, and almost houseless, are there related in a strain partly pathetic and partly arrogant, but which will not be forgotten by those who have ever read them, and which sound stranger still in contrast with the brilliant life which preceded it, and which was, in fact, its cause. Nothing could induce him to reveal his retreat to his guardians, lest he should be forced to return to the hated bondage of school; of which, however, it should be explained that he had nothing whatever to complain, except that it *was* school. At length—it is not explained how—his friends traced him. He went home to his mother, and after a short, and probably very uncomfortable stay, entered at Oxford; with which fact these sketches of personal history close.

The history of such a boyhood is both a literary curiosity and a lesson; as such we have given it at a length which may need some apology. The pleasures, the excitements, the experiences, the acquirements, the trials of a lifetime were all run through at seventeen. Can it be expected that after-life should be otherwise than a falling off in importance and effect from such a beginning? Had his powers been better husbanded, there might

Digitized by Google

have been material for high excellence, both moral and intellectual; and possibly a distinguished man may have been sacrificed to make a remarkable boy. Our only opportunity of judging of the maturity of this remarkable promise, is in the papers and essays which form this collection, which all betray a defective judgment, and more learning than wisdom, though there are nowhere wanting passages of original thought and keen observation: but all spoilt by a self-consciousness so obtrusive that it leads him perpetually to account in a foot-note for his choice of any word or phrase which seems to him peculiarly felicitous; and sometimes marked by a singular obliquity as to what is a fit subject for the pen, or worthy of a sensible man's consideration. Take, for example, his paper on 'The Last Days of Kant,' an infidel though a philosopher. Mr. De Quincey always professes himself a good Christian and good Churchman; we wish to dispute neither. Why, then, should he think it worth while to lay before English readers the puerile details of this unbeliever's life?—prefacing them with this pompous exordium:—

'I take for granted, that all people of education still acknowledge some interest in the personal history of Immanuel Kant, however little their taste, or their opportunities, may have brought them acquainted with the history of Kant's philosophical opinions. A great man, though in an unpopular path, must always be an object of liberal curiosity; to suppose a reader thoroughly indifferent to Kant, is to suppose him thoroughly unintellectual; and, therefore, though he should happen not to regard Kant with interest, it would still be among the fictions of courtesy to presume that he did.'—Vol. iii. p. 99.

We dare to profess, on the part of most of our readers, very little interest in Kant, but were it otherwise our interest would not extend to the miserable details, which are really all that Mr. De Quincey has gathered from the memorials of his servile German disciples: entertaining us—his English Christian readers—with the mode in which the old man wrapped himself up in his bed-clothes—his objection to garters, and expedients for his dispensing with these articles—his impatience for his coffee, and his views on the subject of strong beer.

Another paper, which appeared years ago in 'Blackwood,' is open to the same charge. He calls it a 'foam bubble of gaiety,' and is evidently proud of it by this republication, and appended defence; which, by the way, characteristically branches off into the history of the great Radcliffe highway murder. The point lies in treating murder as a joke. It is a mock lecture on murder, as one of the fine arts, sympathising of course with the murderer, and betraying a morbid fascination with the subject; with little more humour than is found in the ghastly mirth of some of the comic songs of the last century, which placed all their hopes of raising a laugh in the straightfor-

Digitized by Google

ward relation of some fatal casualty. In a postscript the author expresses his indignation at readers of a 'saturnine and gloomy class, without any genial sympathy whatever,' who have resented this joke. He justifies himself by a sally of Swift's, who on one occasion proposed turning to account the supernumerary infants of the three kingdoms, by cooking and eating them. Now first, Swift is not a safe man to follow; and again, an idea may be so forcibly displaced from its ordinary aspect, that the horror of it may be lost—never faced at all—in the novelty. But if Swift had expanded his suggestion into full detail of the vast infanticide necessary to carry out his proposal, and made us dwell upon all the inevitable processes, illustrating them by several individual cases—the joke would have failed, nor would there have been any lack of those reproaches, which he pleads were never showered 'on this dignitary of the supreme Irish Church.' Mr. De Quincey in one place calls hilarity *vulgar*, which shows how little real comprehension of it he possesses. He certainly is seldom lively with any grace, for where his gaiety is open to no other charge, it is forced and unnatural. Witness his narrative of the adventures of a 'Spanish military nun,' a true story, the facts of which are absolutely smothered in pleasantry and lively allusion:—

'She was a *handy* girl. She could turn her hand to anything. Was there ever a girl in this world but herself that cheated and snapped her fingers at that awful Inquisition, which brooded over the convents of Spain? that did this without collusion from outside, trusting to nobody but herself, and what beside? to one needle, two skeins of thread, and a bad pair of scissors! For, that the scissors were bad, though Kate does not say so in her memoirs, I know by an *à priori* argument; viz. because *all* scissors were bad in the year 1607. Now, say all decent logicians, from a universal to a particular *valet consequentia*, the right of inference is good. *All* scissors were bad; *ergo*, *some* scissors were bad.'—Vol. iv. p. 9.

Again, where this same heroine is sinking from weakness, and is restored by stimulants, we have the plain fact recorded with all this wit as an introduction:—

'What is wanted just now for Kate, supposing Kate herself to be wanted by this world, is, that this world would be kind enough to send her a little brandy before it is too late. The simple truth was, and a truth which I have known to take place in more ladies than Kate, who died, or did *not* die, accordingly as they had, or had not, an adviser, like myself, capable of giving an opinion equal to Captain Bunsby's on this point, viz. whether the jewelly star of life had descended too far down the arch towards setting, for any chance of reascending by *spontaneous* effort. The fire was still burning in secret, but needed perhaps to be rekindled by patent artificial breath. It lingered and *might* linger, but apparently would never culminate again without some stimulus from earthly vineyards.'—Vol. iv. p. 57.—*Miscellanies, chiefly narrative.*

To which is appended a very long note of facetious attack on temperance societies, Dr. Darwin, and doctors in general, who

Digitized by Google

have let their patients die for want of brandy, with allusions to the Princess Charlotte, the unhappy end of her physician, and an anecdote told the author by Southey.

But leaving these general subjects, which have nothing personally to do with our author, except as he forcibly connects himself with them, we will return to the recollections, which form the true interest of these volumes. Though the objects of these reminiscences have had more than their share of such notices from the world of writers, and have already supplied innumerable 'recollections,' yet every fresh narrative of personal intercourse with Wordsworth, Southey, and Coleridge, will be entered upon with curiosity and interest. Mr. De Quincey's youthful enthusiasm for the first and last of this trio is creditable to his early discernment. He regards the publication of Wordsworth's 'Lyrical Ballads,' and Coleridge's 'The Ancient Mariner,' which came out in the same volume, when he was yet but thirteen or fourteen, as a great event in unfolding his own mind. These poems were to him a 'ray of a new morning,' a 'revelation of untrodden worlds.' Subsequently, when an Oxford student, and his own master, he made the most determined resolutions to see Coleridge. He had even the idea of following him to Malta on this Quixotic errand; but fortunately that great thinker's timely return to England enabled him to indulge this longing at a more reasonable cost of time and money. Coleridge, however, could never stand the test of close personal contact with his admirer. Mr. De Quincey's first approach to intercourse was distinguished by the detection of a plagiarism. The detection of plagiarisms is one of our author's hobbies, as, perhaps, it is with all great miscellaneous readers; it is one mode of bringing their labours to bear upon their generation. It fell out thus: Coleridge chanced not to be in when this visit was made; but his host hospitably entertained our young pilgrim; and, in the course of conversation, relieved his mind of certain misgivings on the subject of the 'revolting dogma of Pythagoras about beans,' on which Coleridge had been theorising in a manner to excite suspicion. Was his view original? Mr. De Quincey was obliged to witness against him; he knew chapter and verse in the German author who had first offered the solution. The subject is so attractive, that though on the threshold of the longed-for introduction, he detains his readers many pages with instances of this peculiar trait of the philosopher's mind. The occupation is not a dignified one; and, in most cases, the detector of plagiarisms suffers more than his victim in the estimation of the reader. Not that it should be so; but, after all, no man's fame ever stood on what he borrows from another. He would be the same man (except for the suspicion cast on his honesty) in everybody's estimation, if he had not

Digitized by Google

taken the idea, or phrase, or even more voluminous theft, with which he is charged; and this conviction is so strong in the general mind, that men are loth to attribute the act to moral turpitude even where completely proved, but to some more innocent perversity of the memory or judgment; and in most cases the charge is hissed off. That it was thus even in Mr. De Quincey's case we gather from a certain soreness of tone. But Coleridge's morals of action stand on lower grounds than any amount of convinced plagiarism can place him. So we learn from every report of him that ever reached us from any one qualified to judge, and who had opportunity of measuring his magnificent talk with what good talking *should* always result in. Lord Egremont's saying is quoted,—'He talks very much like an angel, and does nothing at all.' However, Coleridge was not always content with doing nothing; and Mr. De Quincey reports language towards his wife — an injured and harmless woman—which no gentleman in the truest sense of the word could have used, especially in speaking of her to a common acquaintance,—and Mr. De Quincey does not profess to be more.

'Coleridge, besides, assured me that his marriage was not his own deliberate act, but was in a manner forced upon his sense of honour by the scrupulous Southey, who insisted that he had gone too far in his attentions to Miss Fricker, for any honourable retreat. On the other hand, a neutral spectator of the parties protested to me, that, if ever in his life he had seen a man under deep fascination, and what he would have called desperately in love, Coleridge, in relation to Miss F., was that man.'—Vol. ii. p. 167.

And thus he excused himself for first slighting, and then deserting his wife. Bearing such traits as these in mind, we grow dead to the reports of his mighty eloquence, which was always ready to overflow upon the first comer. Mr. De Quincey having traced him to his actual place of sojourn, accosts him in the street, and within five minutes we read,—

'That point being settled, Coleridge, like some great river, the Orellana, or the St. Lawrence, that, having been checked and fretted by rocks or thwarting islands, suddenly recovers its volume of waters and its mighty music, swept at once, as if returning to his natural business, into a continuous strain of eloquent dissertation, certainly the most novel, the most finely illustrated, and traversing the most spacious fields of thought, by transitions the most just and logical that it was possible to conceive. What I mean by saying that his transitions were "just," is by way of contradistinction to that mode of conversation which courts variety through links of *verbal* connexions. Coleridge, to many people, and often I have heard the complaint, seemed to wander; and he seemed then to wander the most when, in fact, his resistance to the wandering instinct was greatest—viz. when the compass and huge circuit, by which his illustrations moved, travelled farthest into remote regions before they began to revolve. Long before this coming round commenced, most people had lost him, and naturally enough supposed that he had lost himself. They continued to admire the separate beauty of the thoughts, but did not see their relations

Digitized by Google

to the dominant theme. Had the conversation been thrown upon paper, it might have been easy to trace the continuity of the links.'

* * * * * *

'I can assert, upon my long and intimate knowledge of Coleridge's mind, that logic the most severe was as inalienable from his modes of thinking, as grammar from his language.'—Vol. ii. pp. 158—160.

We need not dwell, however, upon this lengthened sketch. Since it was written fuller memorials have appeared, putting the reader in possession of more facts. The same may be said of Wordsworth, and yet there are descriptions of him in his domestic aspect which are still well worth reading, and the picture of his sister conveys, we believe, a fuller idea of that very interesting woman than can be acquired elsewhere. The paper upon Wordsworth is prefaced by a mention of the author's singular boyish awe and veneration of this great poet: a sensation formed entirely on his own estimate of his poetry, and so overpowering that having, while a very young man, actually travelled to Westmoreland for the purpose of being introduced to him, (not without the encouragement of an expressed wish on Wordsworth's part some time previously,) he actually lost courage on coming in sight of the poet's white cottage, and turned back again. His actual introduction took place some years later, on occasion of his escorting Mrs. Coleridge and her children to Keswick, taking Grasmere by the way. His welcome, then, was a kind and cordial one, and the whole scene was in harmony with his raised expectations. Indeed, in all the reports of Wordsworth, though there may be mortifying hints or more express notices of petty foibles to mar the completeness of the picture, yet he does, as a whole, present a picture of what a poet, and a poet's life, ought to be, such as cannot be matched elsewhere. And to this completeness the ladies of his family mainly contribute; admirable accessories they are, gentle, serene satellites: content to set him forth as the central object; to be known only through him; to make their whole being minister to him. This office we are accustomed to think natural in a wife, but the sister's added devotion is a peculiar feature in this model home. Nor can it be guessed to what extent her influence may have told on the development and harmonising of his highest intellectual gifts.

After a hasty greeting from the poet, who had to pass on to receive his other guests, our author gives his introduction to Mrs. and Miss Wordsworth, which we must abridge. He had entered the cottage parlour:—

'From the exuberant luxuriance of the vegetation around it, and from the dark hue of the wainscoting, this window, though tolerably large, did not furnish a very powerful light to one who entered from the open air. However, I saw sufficiently to be aware of two ladies just entering the room through a doorway opening upon a little staircase. The foremost, a

Digitized by Google

tallish young woman, with the most winning expression of benignity upon her features, advanced to me, presenting her hand with so frank an air, that all embarrassment must have fled in a moment, before the native goodness of her manner. This was Mrs. Wordsworth, cousin of the poet; and, for the last five years or more, his wife. She was now mother of two children, a son and a daughter; and she furnished a remarkable proof how possible it is for a woman neither handsome nor even comely, according to the rigour of criticism—nay, generally pronounced very plain—to exercise all the practical fascination of beauty, through the mere compensatory charms of sweetness all but angelic, of simplicity the most entire, womanly self-respect and purity of heart speaking through all her looks, acts, and movements. *Words*, I was going to have added; but her words were few. In reality, she talked so little, that Mr. Slave-Trade Clarkson used to allege against her, that she could only say "*God bless you!*" Certainly, her intellect was not of an active order; but, in a quiescent, reposing, meditative way, she appeared always to have a genial enjoyment from her own thoughts.'

* * * * * *

'In complexion she was fair, and there was something peculiarly pleasing even in this accident of the skin, for it was accompanied by an animated expression of health, a blessing which, in fact, she possessed uninterruptedly. Her eyes, the reader may already know, were

> "Like stars of twilight fair;
> Like twilight, too, her dark brown hair;
> But all things else about her drawn
> From May-time and the cheerful dawn."

Yet strange it is to tell that, in these eyes of vesper gentleness, there was a considerable obliquity of vision; and much beyond that slight obliquity which is often supposed to be an attractive foible in the countenance: this *ought* to have been displeasing or repulsive; yet, in fact, it was not. Indeed, all faults, had they been ten times more and greater, would have been neutralised by that supreme expression of her features, to the unity of which every lineament in the fixed parts, and every undulation in the moving parts of her countenance, concurred—viz. a sunny benignity—a radiant graciousness—such as in this world I never saw surpassed.'—Vol. ii. pp. 236—238.

Then follows the sister, in striking and happy contrast. It should be explained that the age of both ladies at this time was about twenty-eight.

'Immediately behind her moved a lady, shorter, slighter, and perhaps, in all other respects, as different from her in personal characteristics, as could have been wished for the most effective contrast. "Her face was of Egyptian brown;" rarely, in a woman of English birth, had I seen a more determinate gipsy tan. Her eyes were not soft, as Mrs. Wordsworth's, nor were they fierce or bold; but they were wild and startling, and hurried in their motion. Her manner was warm and even ardent; her sensibility seemed constitutionally deep; and some subtle fire of impassioned intellect apparently burned within her, which, being alternately pushed forward into a conspicuous expression by the irrepressible instincts of her temperament, and then immediately checked, in obedience to the decorum of her sex and age, and her maidenly condition, gave to her whole demeanour, and to her conversation, an air of embarrassment, and even of self-conflict, that was almost distressing to witness. Even her very utterance and enunciation often suffered in point of clearness and steadiness, from the

Digitized by Google

agitation of her excessive organic sensibility. At times, the self-counteraction and self-baffling of her feelings caused her even to stammer, and so determinately to stammer, that a stranger who should have seen her and quitted her in that state of feeling, would have certainly set her down for one plagued with that infirmity of speech, as distressingly as Charles Lamb himself. This was Miss Wordsworth, the only sister of the poet—his "Dorothy;" who naturally owed so much to the lifelong intercourse with her great brother in his most solitary and sequestered years; but, on the other hand, to whom he has acknowledged obligations of the profoundest nature; and, in particular, this mighty one, through which we also, the admirers and the worshippers of this great poet, are become equally her debtors—that, whereas the intellect of Wordsworth was, by its original tendency, too stern, too austere, too much enamoured of an ascetic harsh sublimity, she it was—the lady who paced by his side continually through sylvan and mountain tracks, in Highland glens, and in the dim recesses of German charcoal-burners—that first *couched* his eye to the sense of beauty, humanised him by the gentler charities, and engrafted, with her delicate female touch, those graces upon the ruder growths of his nature, which have since clothed the forest of his genius with a foliage corresponding in loveliness and beauty to the strength of its boughs and the massiness of its trunks. The greatest deduction from Miss Wordsworth's attractions, and from the exceeding interest which surrounded her in right of her character, of her history, and of the relation which she fulfilled towards her brother, was the glancing quickness of her motions, and other circumstances in her deportment (such as her stooping attitude when walking), which gave an ungraceful, and even an unsexual character to her appearance when out-of-doors. She did not cultivate the graces which preside over the person and its carriage. But, on the other hand, she was a person of very remarkable endowments intellectually; and, in addition to the other great services which she rendered to her brother, this I may mention, as greater than all the rest, and it was one which equally operated to the benefit of every casual companion in a walk—viz. the exceeding sympathy, always ready and always profound, by which she made all that one could tell her, all that one could describe, all that one could quote from a foreign author, reverberate, as it were, *à plusieurs reprises*, to one's own feelings, by the manifest impression it made upon *hers*. The pulses of light are not more quick or more inevitable in their flow and undulation, than were the answering and echoing movements of her sympathising attention. Her knowledge of literature was irregular, and thoroughly unsystematic. She was content to be ignorant of many things; but what she knew and had really mastered, lay where it could not be disturbed—in the temple of her own most fervid heart.'—Vol. ii. pp. 238—240.

These are handsome, liberal-minded portraits, which sound both true and hearty. Perhaps it is not in the nature of things that the object of his supreme youthful devotion, the poet himself, should come off as well,—that he should not have to pay for having raised a class of feelings which our middle age is apt to scrutinize. The mature mind is prone to resent its youthful idolatries; and there follows a reaction. Nor could any human being have come up to Mr. De Quincey's ideal. As it is, we find him in his personal sketch instantly falling foul of Wordsworth's *legs;*—they were useful legs but certainly not ornamental; he ought to have had an extra pair for dress occasions: the ladies

Digitized by Google

found fault with them; a sculptor would have disapproved of their contour. Now all this about the legs is probably true, but one does not quite see why it should be made so prominent. But the worst part was his bust; he was narrow about the shoulders, and stooped, which gave an effect of 'meanness,' when placed in juxtaposition with a figure of statuesque build. This, by the way, we should plead is scarcely a fair test. One tall man in a company has always the unhappy power of making everybody around him look ill-shaped and dwarfish; he alters the standard of our eye, and forces odious comparisons. It was hardly fair, we think, in the following passage, to quote the frank sister's saying, and to make her participate in the offensive charge of 'meanness':—

'Once on a summer evening, walking in the Vale of Langdale with Wordsworth, his sister, and Mr. J——, a native Westmoreland clergyman, I remember that Miss Wordsworth was positively mortified by the peculiar illustration which settled upon this defective conformation. Mr. J——, a fine towering figure, six feet high, massy and columnar in his proportions, happened to be walking, a little in advance, with Wordsworth; Miss Wordsworth and myself being in the rear; and from the nature of the conversation which then prevailed in our front rank, something or other about money, devises, buying and selling, we of the rear-guard thought it requisite to preserve this arrangement for a space of three miles or more; during which time, at intervals, Miss Wordsworth would exclaim, in a tone of vexation, "Is it possible?—can that be William? How very mean he looks!" And she did not conceal a mortification that seemed really painful, until I, for my part, could not forbear laughing outright at the serious interest which she carried into this trifle. She was, however, right, as regarded the mere visual judgment. Wordsworth's figure, with all its defects, was brought into powerful relief by one which had been cast in a more square and massy mould; and in such a case it impressed a spectator with a sense of absolute meanness, more especially when viewed from behind, and not counteracted by his countenance; and yet Wordsworth was of a good height (five feet ten), and not a slender man; on the contrary, by the side of Southey, his limbs looked thick, almost in a disproportionate degree. But the total effect of Wordsworth's person was always worst in a state of motion. Meantime, his face—that was one which would have made amends for greater defects of figure. Many such, and finer, I have seen amongst the portraits of Titian, and, in a later period, amongst those of Vandyke, from the great era of Charles I., as also from the court of Elizabeth and of Charles II., but none which has more impressed me in my own time.'—Vol. ii. pp. 243, 244.

It is fortunate for Wordsworth's physiognomy that Mr. De Quincey, a book fancier, should have possessed a unique copy of Milton, with a rare portrait; the pleasure of discovering a striking likeness between these two poets, has preserved the face from such dishonours as the figure has sustained. Something of the same splenetic tone, which characterises remarks eulogistic in the main, is to be observed in other notices of this great poet. He suspects him of not having been an amiable boy. He will

Digitized by Google

not allow that he can ever have been a lover, in any passionate sense of the word: 'to lie at a woman's feet, to make her his idol, to worship her many caprices, and to adore the most unreasonable of her frowns'—these things were impossible to Wordsworth, and being so, never, in any emphatic sense, he somewhat arbitrarily asserts, could he have been a lover. Also, he most unnecessarily records that the poet was once 'inebriated at Cambridge;' though the word, from subsequent explanation, proves too strong a one for the occasion; and he charges him besides with having been a dandy, though 'that must have been a long time ago.' The extraordinary prosperity of Wordsworth's career seems also to have been some trial to our author. He does not say that the poet did anything unworthy to gain this prosperity; nothing of the kind; but fortune favoured him—he never was in straits or difficulties, and, exactly as he needed some addition to his means, it fell unsought for to his hands. So that we are assured:—

'So true it is, that still, as Wordsworth needed a place or a fortune, the holder of that place or fortune was immediately served with a summons to surrender it: so certainly was this impressed upon my belief, as one of the blind necessities, making up the prosperity and fixed destiny of Wordsworth, that, for myself, had I happened to know of any peculiar adaptation in an estate or office of mine to an existing need of Wordsworth's, forthwith, and with the speed of a man running for his life, I would have laid it down at his feet. "Take it," I should have said; "take it, or in three weeks I shall be a dead man."'—Vol. ii. pp. 303, 304.

This prosperity, however, came by degrees; it was, we must suppose, in its humble beginnings when this acquaintance was first formed; nor did these modifications intrude themselves into the enthusiasm of Wordsworth's admirer, even upon a more composed observation, till time had given him opportunities for criticism, and familiarity had produced some of its inevitable fruits. It is not to be expected that great men should sustain, in familiar intercourse, the hopes and expectations their works raise; and it is not amiss that this truth should be known, for all truth is useful; but still there is something in the tone of these memorials that jars on us. It is pleasant then to return to a picture of unalloyed first impressions; to find how perfectly the poet's home must have harmonised with expectations formed upon the lofty philosophic simplicity of his professed views of life:—

'About four o'clock it might be when we arrived. At that hour, in November, the daylight soon declined; and, in an hour and a half, we were all collected about the tea-table. This, with the Wordsworths, under the simple rustic system of habits which they cherished then, and for twenty years after, was the most delightful meal in the day; just as dinner is in great cities, and for the same reason—because it was prolonged into a meal of leisure and conversation. That night I found myself, about eleven at

Digitized by Google

night, in a pretty bed-room, about fourteen feet by twelve. Much I feared that this might turn out the best room in the house; and it illustrates the hospitality of my new friends, to mention that it was. Early in the morning I was awakened by a little voice, issuing from a little cottage bed in an opposite corner, soliloquising in a low tone. I soon recognised the words, "suffered under Pontius Pilate; was crucified, dead, and buried;" and the voice I easily conjectured to be that of the eldest amongst Wordsworth's children, a son, and at that time about three years old. He was a remarkably fine boy in strength and size, promising (which has in fact been realized) a more powerful person, physically, than that of his father. Miss Wordsworth I found making breakfast in the little sitting-room. No urn was there; no glittering breakfast service; a kettle boiled upon the fire, and everything was in harmony with these unpretending arrangements. I rarely had seen so humble a *ménage:* and contrasting the dignity of the man with this honourable poverty, and this courageous avowal of it, his utter absence of all effort to disguise the simple truth of the case, I felt my admiration increased. This, thought I to myself, is indeed, in his own words,

"Plain living, and high thinking."

This is, indeed, to reserve the humility and the parsimonies of life for its bodily enjoyments, and to apply its lavishness and its luxury to its enjoyments of the intellect.'—Vol. ii. pp. 316, 317.

But we fear to have exceeded our limits, and must draw to a close. If some spots of envy at others' greatness may seem here and there to disfigure these sketches of more fortunate and distinguished contemporaries, not a small extenuation lies in the fact of that prematurity of intellect which our author's personal recollections make so conspicuous. Convictions of power and superiority are imbibed by a child thus early gifted, at an age when impressions are deepest, and cannot fail to influence the future character; when lofty expectations of achieving a name and doing great things come as realities rather than hopes. Bitter must be the awakening to the fact, that this early promise is not being fulfilled, that others are passing him in the race, that time is slipping by, and, instead of conscious progress, the mind is visited by 'phantoms of lost power, sudden intimations, and shadowy restorations of forgotten feelings,'—to quote our author's words,—all telling of a past glorious time and hopes never to be realized. It is as the history of a mind that this work is valuable, nor do all its faults and failings detract from its value, in this point of view, nor deprive it of a most instructive moral.

Digitized by Google

ART. V.—*First Report of the Cathedral Commissioners: Replies from the Heads of Houses and Professors at Oxford and Cambridge.* 1854.

ATTENTION is now fairly roused to the subject of the education of the clergy of our Church. Since the commencement of this year, both Universities have been called upon to express their judgment upon plans for improving the theological training of their graduates. The production of these plans is an acknowledgment that the authorities are not satisfied with the existing state of Oxford and Cambridge in this particular; their rejection indicates only that the Convocation at each University were dissatisfied with the particular plans proposed. Since these measures were rejected, the Bishop of Oxford has opened the College at Cuddesden under circumstances which seem to augur a large measure of success. The Cathedral Commissioners have published a Report, from which it appears that they have turned their attention to the advantages of multiplying and reinforcing Colleges such as at present exist at Wells and Chichester. The arguments against such a scheme are boldly and clearly laid down in this same Report, in the remarks of the Heads of Houses and Divinity Professors of both Universities; and the country at large, or rather that part of it which is not led away by the names, but looks to the arguments arranged on either side, is in a better position to discuss and decide upon the question—whether the Universities are adapted to complete the training of all their graduates, or whether this must be wholly or in part handed over to other and differently constituted bodies?

Our readers are aware of the deep sympathy which, from time to time, we have expressed in the success of the Diocesan Theological Colleges. At the risk, however, of repeating some little of that which has already appeared in our pages, we buckle ourselves again to the discussion.

We have said that the Heads of Houses and Divinity Professors of both Universities have generally declared against the institution of Colleges attached to any of our cathedrals. Happily this is not without exception. Three names of note, at least, are appended to some thoughtful remarks on the necessity of such institutions. These names are Dr. Pusey, Dr. Richards, and

Digitized by Google

Dr. Mill. The letter of the venerated Professor of Hebrew is clear and convincing; and as we have derived no small strengthening of our opinions from its perusal, we shall not hesitate to make free use of it in our subjoined remarks.

Now, let us begin with a survey of the chief objections raised by the University authorities against these Colleges. They may be divided into two classes: (1) such as affect the character of the instruction conveyed; (2) such as bear upon the discipline of the students. Some of the former we will detail at length, that our readers may know the precise difficulties which raise the opposition of the Theological Professors.

1. Dr. Heurtley writes that the standard of instruction in these bodies would be inferior to that in the Universities; the larger bodies naturally drawing to themselves the more able instructors.

2. He adds, 'They would have a tendency to foster parties 'in the Church, according to the influence which might happen 'to predominate in them.'

3. And thus the effect would be, 'a lowered tone of theology, and a narrowed spirit.'

Similar objections are found elsewhere. Dr. Jacobson modifies the last. He fears,—

4. If these Colleges are encouraged, we shall have not 'clergy 'of the Church of England for all our dioceses, but clergy of 'school A in diocese A, and of school B in diocese B.'

5. Dr. Ogilvie begs that the course of study of all candidates for Holy Orders may be uniform.

6. Dr. Jenkyns, the late Master of Balliol, and Dr. Hawkins, the Provost of Oriel, see an objection in the concentration of work in the hands of one or two officers of a Cathedral College. They hold that Professors of distinct branches of theology will be by far the most proficient in their several branches.

7. The late Dr. Harington thought that the privacy of the instruction conveyed in these institutions might serve as a veil for unsound teaching.

8. Another Head of a House intimates that one security for 'the *wholesomeness* and *uniformity* of its religious teaching,' which the University of Oxford possesses, lies in the fact that 'most of 'its Professors are appointed by the *Crown* and by *large* bodies 'of electors.'

We have thus grouped together all the objections which relate to the character of the instruction likely to be conveyed in these Colleges, and which compare it unfavourably with that which the Universities afford. We must, however, make some remarks that will assist us in our subsequent discussion.

In the introduction to Mr. Ruskin's 'Seven Lamps of Archi-

Digitized by Google

tecture,' a saying of Turner's is quoted, 'Know what you have to do, and do it;' and the clever, though somewhat eccentric writer, states that failure is more frequently to be attributed to a confused understanding of the thing to be done, than to insufficiency of means or impatience of labour. It would seem somewhat presumptuous in us to tax the *élite* of the Universities with confusion of mind as to the work they are anxious to monopolise; but how else can we escape the difficulty? They have failed in their attempts at clerical education, that is notorious; the country perceives it, their own officers acknowledge it: yet their means are amply sufficient for the work—at least they say so; and we would not charge them with unwillingness to toil in the cause they have undertaken. We are driven, therefore, to the conclusion, that the Universities have never as yet had clearly before them a sketch of the work they have aimed to execute; or if they have gone so far, they have not duly considered the material they have to work upon, nor how far it can be moulded or shaped by the contrivances they are prepared to apply.

We will consider Dr. Ogilvie's statement first. He says, the course of study should be uniform; that is, all the graduates of the University should pass through the same course, should attend the same lectures of the same Professors, and pass the same examinations; and then he seems to hope that we should have uniformity of teaching in the twelve thousand pulpits of the country. It would be very desirable to have such a result; but we do not see how the 'imposing of a uniform system' on candidates for Holy Orders will produce it. For let us take a glance round the lecture-room of the Professor—There is the 'double first,' and there is the unhappy man who was 'plucked' last term; a 'senior wrangler,' and the lowest of the 'extracts;' the accomplished classic and the humblest tyro to whom the University can grant a degree. These pupils the Professor sees before him, and he must adapt his lectures to them. Is he lecturing on Church history, how can he proceed? If he details the dry facts as they occurred, in the bare syllabus which alone can catch the attention of the inferior members of his class, how utterly wasted will his efforts be on the disgusted and *ennuyé* scholar! If he assumes a knowledge of the facts, and in masterly style traces the connexion of event with event, and draws from the stores of the past the lessons of present and eternal value, how completely will the hours of the ignorant hearer be wasted!—the hours which are to him as precious as they are to his more gifted neighbour. And will it not be the same in lectures on the study of Holy Scripture? How is it possible that Dr. Hawkins can adapt his expositions to the mass

Digitized by Google

of students? He will either fly over the heads of two-thirds of his class, or disgust and waste the time of the remainder. In the Michaelmas term of 1854, he gave a course of lectures on the Mystical Sense of Scripture; this course occupied the term. Would it not be the height of cruelty for the Bishops or the University to require the attendance at such lectures of the student who doubts whether he can pass an average ordination examination?

And then, 'uniformity of teaching' seems to imply that the students are as similar in their moral strength and spiritual energy, as in attainments and mental capacity. Dr. Ogilvie allows this; but he takes no account of it. He is not indeed so cruel as his colleague, the Regius Professor, Dr. Jacobson, who would shut out from Holy Orders entirely all those who, feeling themselves unequal to the temptations of the University, desire, under the discipline of a Diocesan College, to form anew habits of steadiness and self-restraint in preparation for their holy work. 'Those who are looking forward to guide and re-'claim others, can hardly (he says) be thought fit for their office, 'if they have not tact to drop a bad acquaintance, or strength of 'mind to alter an unworthy practice.' Yet even S. Paul retired for three years into the wilderness to prepare himself for his work, before he ventured to return to that great city, in which his name was coupled with earlier associations; and in that city he never laboured.

Surely then we may hold it as a fact, that the timid and the strong, the novice and the confirmed Christain, need different treatments; that if two students are equally anxious to devote themselves to their Master's work—the one whose desire has grown with his growth and strengthened with his strength, the other in whom it has been comparatively recently planted; the two students may and should be treated differently. But 'we' (with one voice say the Theological Professors) 'would mix them 'together in our class-room, make them all go through the same 'uniform course: and see how well they will all turn out!' We shall avoid 'peculiarities of doctrine, and of ritual observance;' we shall have 'uniformity of opinion and of feeling;' neither 'low' nor 'high church' will be heard of again, the low will be pulled up and the high will be cut down, all to the one standard of the Regius Professor of Divinity; and, of course, each and every Professor and his successors to the end of time, *must be* exactly like the present, *because* the Professors are mainly (at Oxford, happily not at Cambridge,) appointed by the Crown!

We must not pause, for there is much more to attract our notice. But will Dr. Ogilvie permit us to ask him, what he thinks men are made of? Are their minds and feelings of the

Digitized by Google

consistency of potters' clay when it is put on the wheel, as he may have seen it at Burslem or Worcester? We have heard much of materialism of late; is it lurking in high places of the University of Oxford? The Professor speaks of uniformity of teaching—he aims at uniformity of sentiment. Now what does uniformity imply? It implies absence of all life; for where there is life there is motion and growth. It implies that it is matter on which you act, and matter by which you act. The only process which we can think of as analogous to that which was in Dr. Ogilvie's thoughts, is one that we recently saw in the manufacturing districts. Quantities of cloth, somewhat stained and discoloured, were passed through bleaching vats, and came out cleaned and whitened. This represents the first set of lectures of the Professors, whereby all preconceived opinions of all their auditors are washed out, 'discharged,' and their minds presented, as Locke's sheets of paper, 'to receive all future impressions.' Then the calico is passed over one roller, and receives a 'brown,' under another, and receives some 'green,' and so on and on, yard after yard, and piece after piece, until it comes out, all beautiful, all harmonious, all uniform; but then it is lifeless, as lifeless as the Professor's students would be, if his process could be brought to produce upon them the effect which he desires.

The Church does not want machine-products, nor yet machines. She wants men, living, active, loving men. With these Dr. Ogilvie is not prepared to supply her. The mere listening to sound and sober views of theology, will no more make good clergymen, than the mere listening to good sermons will make good Christians.

But if the Professor would regard his students, not as inanimate clay, but as living branches of the great Vine, he must allow that the course of training may differ to which each branch is subjected. We much doubt whether he has duly considered what the object of this training should be. To us he seems to have lost sight of the end in the means. The trainer of the vine branches will strive that each branch should bear all the fruit of which it is capable. He will modify his treatment according to circumstances. Not so the Professors and Heads of Houses at Oxford and Cambridge. They are anxious to keep up the hold which the Universities have on the country. For this they are anxious to fill their lecture-rooms. They know they ought to have good attendances, and are surprised that they have not. They complain that the Bishops do not enforce the regulations which the University has made. Would it not be better if they looked to themselves and to their work? In no quarter can there be any desire to wrest from them the

Digitized by Google

training of the Clergy; but in no quarter, we trust, will there lurk the feeling that this training must be exacted under pains and penalties. Let the Bishops of our Church make their examinations more comprehensive, and more severe. Let them require from their candidates proofs that they have studied such and such writers, and such and such subjects; but let them not think that the cause of religion will be advanced by compelling all their candidates to go through a special course, or by throwing on the Universities the responsibility of approving or rejecting such candidates. Let the Professors adapt their lectures to the men who will attend them, and then let them take their chance. With a great portion of mankind compulsion works badly, with none more than undergraduates. If they are compelled to attend lectures, they assume that they attend as a matter of discipline, not to receive benefit; the very best lectures then lose their point. We remember well the crowded auditory at Professor Blunt's earlier lectures at Cambridge. Day after day had his sturdy and manly form, so characteristic of the man, to push for itself a way through the crowds that thronged the doorway. Every eye was glistening, every ear attentive; we felt that we were surrounded by a willing audience; we recognised faces there, that we had seen at the delivering of the same course two years, four years previously. Again and again did hearts glow and feelings warm, and a voice was heard in that room the reverberations of which have been felt from Cornwall to Northumberland. But a change was made; a regulation was passed by which attendance on additional lectures was rendered compulsory; and now the Professor stood at the door of a larger room receiving the cards of the immigrants. The whole spirit was gone. Graduates of older standing were kept away; they felt themselves out of place. The class was changed; tutors conversed with pupils who were attending, and found that there was no longer a sound given out by the strings which had vibrated so full a few years before. The men were compelled to attend, but they could not be compelled to listen. The feelings of the willing auditory were chilled by the coldness of the unwilling. It was a fatal mistake. Low Churchmen criticised; High Churchmen were annoyed. The influence of Professor Blunt was diminished by one half. He lost nearly all his hold upon the graduates of the University, who now seldom hear him, save when he speaks from the pulpit of S. Mary's.

We may have exaggerated these consequences of changing a voluntary into a compulsory system, but we have spoken from what came under our own observation at the time; and yet these very lectures on the duties of a parish Priest were the most

Digitized by Google

popular and most practical that the University afforded to the student of theology. What, may we infer, has been the effect of attendance at others which, if not less useful, were undoubtedly less attractive and less spirit-stirring? How many men in either University look back with any degree of satisfaction to the lectures in Divinity which they were compelled to attend, when their minds were wholly bent in another direction, to the Senate House and the Schools?

We declare then distinctly, that we do not see that much benefit has arisen, or is likely to arise, by compelling attendance from all students indiscriminately at the same lectures. We say as distinctly that much benefit may be looked for, if the candidates for Holy Orders, after they have graduated, be permitted to make their choice of two or more modes and places of study. And we shall proceed now to examine whether there is much ground for apprehending the evil, which Drs. Heurtley, Jacobson, and others speak of,—the evil of multiplying or fostering parties in the Church by the diversity of tone which may be expected to be found in the several Diocesan Colleges.

Now, so far as our own experience goes, we would much rather have to contend with a well-instructed and well-educated opponent, than an ignorant one. We believe that the most violent and most virulent partisans are to be found amongst those who have received the worst education in their earlier youth. We do not say that some few very well read and well-informed theologians, may not be found amongst the most eager of the party with whom our Review is held in abhorrence; but these men's reading and information, great as it is, seems very partial: it seems only to have been collected for the sake of defending and upholding certain preconceived views. We may hold that Mr. Ryle, for instance, has forgotten his Bible in his study of the Puritan Divines: Mr. Goode, his Greek Testament, amongst the Calvinist writers of our Church. But so much the more necessary, the attempt at a special preparation. And we may take it for granted, that if any college is notoriously 'High Church,' students who are disposed that way will chiefly frequent it. So for Colleges of another stamp. The pupils will not receive their colour from the building they flock to, but rather choose to flock where they shall find others of the same 'feather.' And now the question arises, whether they will receive injury from thus congregating? We believe not. We believe that men of twenty-two or twenty-three are, generally speaking, shrewd enough to know where there is any attempt to strain a proof: they possess so much of the contradiction of human nature, that they are as likely as not to break away altogether, if the intellectual rein is pulled too tight upon them. Of this, any one conversant

Digitized by Google

with students of the Universities must be aware, and the tutor who is worthy of his post, must adapt himself accordingly. It will be a happy thing for him that his own mind is kept thus constantly in check. And, moreover, if the study of the Holy Volume occupy in all colleges the prominent place which it does in those already founded, the peculiarities of system of the officers will be continually compared with Scripture, and continually rubbed down.

We do not, therefore, sympathise with the lamented Principal of Brazenose in the fear, that by multiplying these Colleges the 'lines of demarcation between the various sections of the Church 'will become wider, deeper, and less capable of obliteration, than 'they are at present.' We have met with a few of the students of S. Aidan's, which it is known is under the especial patronage of the Metropolitan, but they were by no means of that class of ardent Puritans which the 'Record' may be supposed to desire; and why should worse results be anticipated from a College at Islington or at Salford? The training school at Cheltenham, we are told, turns out nearly as good Churchmen as S. Mark's or Battersea, though it was founded in direct opposition to them. Why, then, should we dread opposition to Wells, or Chichester, or Cuddesden? Much explanation of Scripture which is now current, however palatable it may be to admiring readers in Liverpool or London, will scarcely pass muster before a small band of Oxford or Cambridge graduates. They will ask, 'Is 'the system true which needs arguments like this to bolster 'it up?' And the only fear would be lest the stream, which has conveyed over to the Church of Rome so many clergy of our Church, who were originally either Dissenters, or of the Evangelical school of theology, should continue to be fed mainly by the less thoughtful students of these 'Protestant Colleges.' This, we repeat, is our only fear, and we venture to lay it before Lord Shaftesbury and his followers for their grave consideration.

Indeed, if the New Testament Scriptures take the highest place, and the works of our standard divines be well and carefully studied, we confess that we do not see much fear of very extravagant opinions being inculcated, or very outrageous practices being enforced. We find, from an advertisement in the Clergy List of 1854, that these Masters of Theology are not neglected at S. Aidan's. We are told that Hooker's fifth book is read at the Church Missionary College, Islington. Now, is it conceivable that any who have studied our two great luminaries, Hooker and Pearson, and learned how they differ on great and almost fundamental points, will thereafter be as obstinate and self-willed as many of our University ignoramuses are

Digitized by Google

at present? Is it conceivable that they will not learn some modesty, where otherwise they would be positive and presumptuous? Of course, we should prefer a sound Churchman to a Puritan; but we should infinitely prefer a Puritan of education and ability to one who was ignorant and impotent. We do not, therefore, object to—rather we would hail with satisfaction—a College such as is threatened by the friends of the 'Record.' We are confident that the Churchmanship of the country will not suffer from the institution.

But it is time now that we should express our opinion on what the Universities may do, and what they should not attempt to do; and on the principle that by-standers can often see better than the combatants how the battle is waging, we shall even venture to suggest to the authorities of the Universities how they may improve the course which they have laid down.

We would consider then, first, the classes into which, intellectually speaking, the graduates of the Universities may be divided. It will be impossible to draw the limits very closely, but it seems to us that the following sketch is tolerably correct.

First, then, will come the men of extraordinary talent,—the Herschels, or Kayes, or Gladstones of their year,—men who seem to catch up the contents of a book by intuition, and to whom it would be torture worse than the thumbscrew to be compelled to pass the ordeal of four or six courses of ordinary lectures. But these are not more than two or three in each year, and may be left to themselves; they are scarcely reducible to law.

We shall then come to a large body, including almost all those who subsequently fill the most important offices in their Colleges; men who are not ashamed to confess, that they gained such distinctions as they possess by hard study and diligent labour, and who must go through study as hard, and labour as diligent, to become familiar with the lines of Butler's argument, —to appropriate the lessons of wisdom contained in Hooker's writings,—to store in their memory the results of the learning and thought of Pearson. It may be somewhat dull to such men to read these works, without the opportunity of conversation upon them,—without knowing beforehand where they may find a landing-place to rest for a moment; but still the discipline is good, and they are equal to their work: they go on cheerily, and thank God they have been required by the Bishop to make this first inroad into the realms of theology, and been allowed to carry away some of the spoil. But still a few lectures to guide them, and help them, and throw light from modern investigation on these noble fabrics of the past, would have been thankfully welcome, and perhaps have served to clear away some mists

Digitized by Google

which otherwise hang over them for years. Lectures on doctrinal subjects too, keeping up with the controversies of the day,—on the state of the dispute with Popery, schism, unbelief,—on history, assuming that names, and events, and dates are tolerably known,—would be equally acceptable; and, by one and all, the hints on the parochial work, which the experienced and active pastor alone gains power to give, would be welcomed. Perhaps this division would include about one-third of the whole number which the Universities annually send up for Holy Orders,—say eighty each at Oxford and Cambridge.

The remaining one hundred and seventy will include men of very different powers and advantages. Some will have commenced their preparation for Holy Orders late in life; and although now released from the trammels of the University course, and soon evincing their superiority to many who have eclipsed them in the schools, yet they still need some special training, some additional discipline of the mind and heart. Others there are who having (thanks to their early education) mastered with ease the Latin and Greek of the University schools, are yet utterly deficient in that knowledge of their neighbour and themselves, which must be laid as a foundation before they can hope to do much good as ministers of God. Some will need assistance in the perusal of the writings we have named: not content with mere general directions for their study, will probably, if left to themselves, 'get the books up' by analysis. Some are utterly ignorant of the facts of history, and must learn facts and principles together. All are alike in the dark as to the working of a parish, of schools, visiting societies, and so forth. Few have ever been accustomed to commit their thoughts to writing, and yet must now prepare to compose three or four sermons a month. Most are anxious to know something more of the controversies of the day than they can pick up from newspapers, or reviews, or books. Now, this is the class of men which Heads of Houses and Professors lose sight of. It is not easy to foresee their difficulties,—impossible, without constant intercourse with them, to know their wants. Yet this is by far the largest portion of those who go into Orders; it will be found in the end to include some of the best and most energetic of the clergy of the country. If they have little taste for prolonged study, and much unwillingness to split hairs in logic, they have often an Englishman's determination to do his duty; and at the board of guardians, or the committee of a society, or at the clerical meeting, will carry a weight which their more learned though less active neighbours cannot command. Yet these, we repeat, are neglected at the Universities, they are left to find their way to their degrees much as they can. The course to which they are subjected is (at Cam-

Digitized by Google

bridge at least) the worst that could be devised; but still they push on through it with dogged determination, and at length turn the tables on their preceptors in the House of Commons, or on the bench.

Now, these are men whom it is purely and simply absurd to compel to attend more than one course of Professors' lectures. One course may be adapted to them; but more than one is scarcely feasible. If, indeed, the Universities require three or four; if they compel an attendance on a long series on Irenæus or Origen, or on the Mystical Sense of Holy Scripture; and if the Bishops support the Universities, the men will go—they will go as they would mount the heights of Alma, or ride off with the light division on the fatal October 25; they will go, because they are expected to do so, because it is their duty. But is it desirable to compel them? If more accurate knowledge may be gained on the more important subjects by another way; if by splitting up the class of 210 into ten classes of twenty-one, or twenty-one classes of ten, conversation can be permitted, questions can be put, doubts cleared up, accuracy gained—surely it is the height of folly to make all these men exhibit themselves before the Professor. Put S. John's Gospel, or S. Paul's Epistles, in the place of Irenæus; and the study of Prophecy in the place of the Mystical Sense of Scripture, and the difficulty is not removed. They must be orations or sermons, not lectures, when delivered before large masses of men; twenty is the largest number that could be admitted to a catechetical lecture, and in such lecture alone (as Dr. Pusey says) is it possible to become acquainted with the individual character, or to track the individual mind. We are only surprised that no one except Dr. Pusey considered that such knowledge of individual character was desirable, or such individual training feasible. We shall take it therefore as an established fact, that if the education for Holy Orders is to include at all the training of the individual mind, or the culture of the individual heart — if we are to consider that men are not all made after the same uniform model, nor can all be treated in the same uniform fashion—we must give up all notion of dealing with them in the gross; these large classes must be broken up into smaller ones, these regiments must be trained by companies. Dr. Pusey considers that if the preparation of the graduate for the ministry of the Church should last over two years, which he deems (and our experience justifies the opinion) to be scarcely more than sufficient, it would require in each University not six, but thirty-six Professors. Assuming that 234 is the number which annually leaves Oxford for the ministry of the Church, (which is rather below the average,) he calculates there would be 468 students attending lectures at the same time. Supposing

Digitized by Google

that each attended two lectures each day during term time, there must be 936 attendances; divide these into classes of twenty-five, and there must be more than thirty-six lectures delivered daily. There should be therefore as many Professors. If it be deemed that one year's training is enough for the future pastor, who is to apply to each individual case the spiritual medicine which the disease of his soul requires; if twelve months are to suffice for acquiring good and competent knowledge of the Sacred Writings, of the great truths of the Gospel, and of the doctrines founded upon those truths, of ecclesiastical history, ancient and modern, of the more difficult and more delicate points connected with the preaching of the truth, and of the cure of souls; if for all this twelve months', or rather twenty-three weeks' training, be deemed by our Bishops and our Universities sufficient, even then eighteen Professors will be required: a number three times as great as Oxford possesses or Cambridge aspires to. The alternative is, that the classes in Divinity must consist of seventy-five instead of twenty-five; or if each Professor has two classes during the same term, he must have 150 pupils under his eye at once. We ask, how can it be possible for him to pay attention to each of these 150 souls?

It is to us, therefore, a matter of surprise to find that the Heads of Houses and Professors are unwilling to see their labour diminished, their powers of usefulness increased. We can scarcely understand the nervous apprehensions which the bare contemplation of a few Clerical Colleges scattered throughout the country has caused in the Oxford and Cambridge mind. One Doctor after another states, that these colleges are not wanted, that the instruction there will be poor, that the residence will be costly, that there will be wasted time and scattered energies, that the discipline will be defective, bad habits formed, dangerous tastes strengthened; and yet if the slightest countenance be given to them by the Bishop or by the Cathedral Commission, the Universities will be deserted, and the cathedral cities filled. If fear be—as the Son of Sirach says it is—a betrayal of the succours which reason offers, the apprehensions of the academic authorities indicate that they deem not their position strong, nor their arguments powerful. But surely the above calculation will help to reassure them. It proves that with their present staff, provided each Professor will lecture once a-day, and each student will attend two lectures for one year, Cambridge can undertake the preparation of 75 men, Oxford of 150; the two Universities together, of 225. Should a two-years' course be deemed necessary, this number must be reduced to 112. If we reckon the number of graduates for Oxford and Cambridge, ordained in each year, at 500, there will be, in the former case, 275, in the latter, 388, students in Theology, whom the Universities cannot assist.

Digitized by Google

Surely then the institution of five, six, or even ten Colleges elsewhere need not be so dreaded by the Professors, as if their class-rooms would then be entirely drained. Whatever advantages the Universities really possess will remain with them; the talented occupants of the chairs of Theology will have their work more defined, and their labours better appreciated by the classes, whom they might then expect to command.

We have endeavoured to classify the graduates of the Universities. We have drawn lines, which we think will be generally found to be sufficiently distinct, between those who need no assistance in the study of the great and standard Divines of the Church, and those who (whether they feel the need or no) would be much benefited by such assistance. The latter we have said is the larger class, the former the more talented. It is still a question, how this larger class should be treated; the experience of the Church of England in this matter lies as yet in very small compass. By the kind permission of the Principal of the College at Wells, we are enabled to describe what has been found practical there. Not being tied by the rules of the University vacations, (which, by the way, must be of very recent formation, for, in the time of Ambrose Bonwicke, the College lectures went on as much in vacation time as in term time,) the students at Wells as at Chichester are in residence about thirty-two weeks in the year. The lectures occupy two hours a-day, besides which, the time of the officers is much taken up with private intercourse with their pupils. Of the twelve lectures delivered in the week, we understand that four are occupied with the Gospels, four with the Epistles, three either with one of the early Fathers, including the subject for the examination at Cambridge, or else on Church History, and one throughout the year on the duties and responsibilities of the ministerial office. In this scheme it will be noticed that the works of our standard writers occupy no place, but, of course, they are not omitted. Bishops Butler and Pearson, Hooker's fifth book, and Professor Harold Browne's volume on the Articles, are read and analyzed by the students, under the direction of the officers. Instruction is given in Hebrew to those who desire it; voluntary classes are formed for the further reading of any of the Church writers. Sermons are written once a fortnight, and as the year's education draws to a close, the student is taken amongst some of the poor of the city to learn something of the work which he has to perform. A similar course is, as far as practicable, followed at Chichester, and we suppose at Cuddesden; and we believe the three officers at Wells would give ready testimony to the Professors of the Universities, if the latter would deign to consult them, that with forty students, their time is fully occupied.

When we compare this course with that which a student will

Digitized by Google

find ready for him at Oxford or Cambridge, we need not be surprised that he will prefer Wells; for Dr. Heurtley may speak of a 'lowered tone of Theology' as likely to result from these Colleges, and talk complacently of the superior instruction given at the Universities, but what has Oxford to show compared with this? Is there any *course* of Theology at all there? There are lectures delivered by able men, but is there any system in these lectures? any unity? any attempt at order or completeness? any one Professor specially responsible for the spiritual or moral guidance of a pupil? No, not at all. If a student desires to appear at the University examination in Theology, he must be passed on from one Professor to another, and from him to a third; passed on before he can either know or be known. He is handed on, perhaps, at the time when the stiffness of academic form is beginning to wear away; the cold breeze passes over him again, and he begins a new term, hard and unbending as before.

And at the risk of being deemed somewhat captious, we will add that, in our opinion, the large income and comfortable positions of the Professors will almost universally prove a bar against confidential and friendly intercourse with their pupils. How can he, who, after spending five or six hundred pounds over his education, is now hoping by some piece of fortune to obtain a curacy which will bring him in seventy or eighty pounds a year, expect much sympathy from a dignitary of the Church, and a Professor of the University, who has had little struggle with the world since he obtained his bachelor's degree, but has moved on by the most easy gradations of fellowship, tutorship, college living, into a stall at Christ Church, and a chair in the Schools? The great virtue ordinarily called out in the Fellow of a college, is, as too many know, patience; if they will only rest patiently, they will, in the end, sink into a well-cushioned chair, or a well-provisioned rectory. But the poor curate, whose official stipend for the first ten or twenty years of his active life will be probably less than the salary of a nobleman's butler, whatever need he has of patience, must exercise other virtues too. He has to fight against the world, he has to combat vice in its strong holds, he has to struggle with the sin which his difficulties exhibit to him, as retaining still a fearful hold upon his heart. By self-denial and exertion and example will he have to fight his way; with many a strong and earnest, and it may be bitter cry, will his prayer have to ascend on high; but where among the Professors at Oxford, where at Cambridge, will he meet with sympathy in this? Where at colleges elsewhere, if the heads of these institutions have had few trials and struggles of their own, if their income is so great as to lift them far above the level of

Digitized by Google

their pupils, if the number of these pupils becomes so large as to prevent the intercourse we have described?

We state it then as our deliberate conviction, that the Universities can never become nurseries for the clergy, so long as the teacher and the taught are prevented from holding friendly intercourse. It is not instruction that the newly-fledged B.A. *feels* he wants. He knows that by tolerably steady reading, he may be prepared to pass the stiffest of Ordination examinations. He feels that he wants a friend, and those who know Mr. Pinder, know that he will meet with a friend at Wells. But, as one amongst two hundred, who each term pass through the lecture-room of each of the Oxford Professors, what hope has he of making a friend among them?

And now that we have learnt what is the intellectual, and what the moral training of which the majority of students in their preparation for Holy Orders stand in need, may we be permitted to inquire, whether it is worth while meeting the objection, that the most able men, intellectually speaking, will be found in the Universities? Our own opinion is, that men of very great genius will be quite out of place in the nurseries of the clergy. The work at Wells and Chichester is, as we have seen, one of considerable labour, some would say, of considerable drudgery. It can only be lightened by the hope that the officers are spending themselves in God's service. Indeed, there can be little doubt that in the Universities themselves intellectual ability is much overrated. Like every other endowment, it may or it may not be devoted to the service of Him who gave it. We should say it would be a very useful, because a very humbling ordeal, if the Heads of Houses and great men of Oxford and Cambridge were required to serve an apprenticeship, of a couple of years or more, in a parish at London or Manchester; they would return to their colleges humbler and wiser men; and so we repeat, that men of great genius might be out of place in the nurseries of the clergy. The last few years have taught us how difficult it is even to pious men who are endowed with an active imagination, to restrain within due bounds its excursions, when it is engaged upon holy things. But surely the success of one of the Colleges, which has existed for fifteen years, should have indicated to Dr. Jacobson and his brother Professors, that Oxford and Cambridge do not as yet monopolize all the practical talent of the country. And, to one 'advantage' claimed by Dr. Hawkins we decidedly object. He writes, that 'one or two teachers engaged upon all 'parts of Theology, will not be so good as several Professors 'occupied with the several branches of the study.' This may be true, if our aim be to train a high class of theologians; but when the necessities of the clergy, as ministers of God's word,

Digitized by Google

are considered, we doubt whether this dissociation of work is desirable; and, for the Professors themselves, we doubt whether they can deliver course after course on the same subject, term after term, and year after year, without their zeal flagging, or their attention waning; and still greater is the danger of their losing sight of the bearing which their special subject has on the whole training of their pupils.

And, to our minds, there is another difficulty connected with this distribution of the work of teaching. We refer to the want of distinctive character which the teaching will assume. For we confess plainly that we cannot see how any good school can be without a distinctive character; and we are confident that that cannot be a school at all where different opinions upon all subjects are laid before the students, and they are left to pick their way through the confusion around them. If the Heads and Professors deem that such is the ideal of University teaching, and that the regulations, which require the students to attend two or four courses delivered by different Professors, will tend to keep their minds in equilibrium, all that we can say is, that they must be vastly ignorant of the moral and intellectual condition of the majority of their graduates. It seems to us as absurd as to attempt to make men physicians, by calling upon them to study Hydropathy, Homœopathy, Alloiopathy at once. We have no reason to doubt that the five Divinity Professors at Oxford and the three at Cambridge are tolerably well agreed as to their general principles, but even the characteristics of the individual Professors throw a different phase upon these principles, and to a young student even this is embarrassing unless some one takes the decided lead. But, we repeat, it is not by training the head that influence is gained; the heart has far more sway over the head than the head has over the heart; and that training is in the highest degree deficient in which the heart is neglected. Even when there is some admixture of error in what is laid before the student, there is a wonderful power of correction in the warm feelings and enkindled zeal. If we may so say, the power of Dr. Pusey has been extended over thousands who do not feel agreement with many points of his system; the influence of Mr. Maurice was much dreaded twelve months ago—so much had he gained the love and admiration of his pupils. But now, though his opinions, we are told, have not gained much hold on the students of King's College, the effect of his zeal remains. With Mr. Buddicom at S. Bees', and Dr. Baylee at S. Aidan's, it is the same—it has been the man, not his sentiments, which has worked for good; and so of Dr. Arnold. And if our readers will take the trouble to review those periods of their life in which their opinions, their habits, their character, were forming, they will find that the main influence exerted upon them was either

Digitized by Google

that of a society, such as their school or college, or else that of some *one* man. At successive periods different men may have worked upon them; but never different men at the same time. And this is a point which Oxford Boards and Cambridge Syndicates ignore. Apprehending that some one Professor might become popular, and his fellow-workers jealous, they compel the student to attend different courses delivered by different Professors; thus adding to confusion in the *mind* of the pupil, the dissipation of the influences which should bear on his *heart*.

But if it be said that this process will help the student to think, we again demur to the remark. We cannot think of subjects of which we are learning the very rudiments. We cannot arrange and compare, if we want materials wherewith to store our minds and our memories. Every one who has taken pains in a lecture-room—every one who has attempted to make the children in his school to think—must know that information must precede comparison. All education commences with faith—with a confiding in the authorities of the teacher. The period when we test the value of that authority must follow; but, if the authority is divided and dissonant, trust there is none, and so there is an end to teaching. We come again, therefore, to our point, that one great bane of Professorial teaching is its want of unity; one advantage of smaller schools of Theology is that very fact which the Professors refer to as a fatal characteristic, viz. one man is responsible for the whole.[1]

There is, however, one course open to the officers of the Universities, if they would retain the education of the clergy in

---

[1] It is a great mistake to suppose that a student is a fool who is ignorant, and, therefore, unable to think on particular subjects: people are never fools in the matters with which they are familiar; and all teachers must recognise this fact, or their powers of teaching will be much injured. If our clergy were by a year's or a year-and-a-half's training made more familiar with the truths of Revelation, they would find it more easy to exercise their own minds upon them afterwards, and would be less liable to follow the guidance of a party-leader. It is by constantly laying before our people at Church the great truths of Christianity, that we hope to make them think over and meditate upon them. They compare what we say on one Sunday with what we say on another, and gradually form a more and more sound idea of them.

We are trespassing somewhat beyond our limits when we complain, that at Cambridge all but candidates for honours are forbidden to think. This has been the effect of some unhappy changes introduced into the examination for the Poll some twelve or fourteen years ago. They are compelled to know a little of some ten or twelve subjects; so little that it neither interests nor instructs, neither informs nor educates. So long as 200 men annually come up to Cambridge at the age of eighteen or nineteen, and take their degrees at twenty-two, spending their last year in learning by rote the reason why a lever balances and a pump works; so long as there is no encouragement to obtain a greater knowledge in any one of the multifarious subjects which the Encyclopædists of Cambridge require, so long will that University stand in the way of efficient training for any profession. The student has to learn a number of isolated facts, is never able to compare, and therefore, is never encouraged to think: his education must begin again.

Digitized by Google

the hands of the ancient bodies. They must attempt it in their collegiate, not in their academic character. It must be made the work of one of the Fellows of each college, to superintend the reading and training of the candidate. Dr. Cartmell, the Master of Christ's College, looks to this; he writes—"I think that it is within the means of *the several Colleges of the University*, assisted by the lectures of the Theological Professors, to supply to candidates for Holy Orders such preparation and instruction as they may require." We do not believe that this would equal the training at Wells; we do believe that it is the only way that the University can do anything really valuable. To the University Professors would be left probably the more difficult and interesting branches of study—lectures illustrating the history of the Church, or the early Fathers, or some leading controversies, or the duties, &c. of the parish priest. To the College Tutor would be intrusted the training of character, the charge of the private studies, the care that the students read and profited by the works of our great Divines, that they became conversant with the Articles of the Church, and acquainted with the original of our New Testament, that they were practised in composition and sermon-writing, and perhaps in schools and visiting. Without such collegiate training, we look for no advantage from attendance on additional Professorial lectures.

And should the Colleges of the Universities determine to take a share in this great work of training ministers for the Church, we feel confident that incalculable benefit will be reflected back on those who engage heart and soul in it. Cambridge has certainly advanced much in the last twenty years; the anecdotes collected by the late Mr. Gunning exhibit the vast progress which the University has made in general tone since the commencement of this century. Still every one who has passed from the clerical society of Cambridge to similar society in London, or any large town, or any country place, must have felt that there is a character about the latter in which the former is deficient. And the cause of the difference is not hard to find out. Partly, perhaps, from the frequent recurrence of a certain class of faults—say indolence and irregularity—the consequences of which the College Tutor is not able to trace into future life, he is led insensibly to acquiesce in that, which comes before the parish clergyman as one out of many evils, against which he must struggle manfully, or he is not fit for his post. Partly, again, from the want of experience and knowledge of mankind in the College officer, his mind never has the opportunity of working on those interesting practical questions which daily force themselves on the attention of the thoughtful 'Curate.' He has no difficulties as to servants, tradesmen, friends, neighbours; no

Digitized by Google

awkward parishioners to deal with; no vestries to meet—everything comes to hand, if he will only give the order.

But if the College were to undertake this work; if under some responsible officer of their society one or two additional Fellows would take part in it; if in addition to the properties of matter, and the facts of geometry, and the niceties of analysis, the truths of Revealed Religion received some share of the attention of men versed in the history and philosophy of the Inductive Sciences; if, again, our classical lecturers were called upon more frequently to bring to bear upon the Old and New Testament, or the History of the Church, and on what we may call the Philosophy of the New Covenant, the knowledge of ancient language and feeling which they have gained, we cannot doubt but that ere long the practical life of Christianity in all its bearings would be felt at the Universities, in a degree of which at present they are scarcely sensible. We feel assured that the complaints will be no more heard which from time to time are whispered in London and elsewhere, that the Universities are unfavourable places for the development of talent; that a fellowship is deemed only a reward for past exertions, but no longer as furnishing the opportunity and incentive to subsequent and more lasting efforts.

But still, however great the advantages may be to the Colleges to have the study of Theology, or rather, as we should put it, the preparation for the ministry of the Church of God, formally recognised as part of their work, we much doubt whether it would be equally to be desired, on behalf of the members of the University, that they should be compelled to reside, and go through a course of instruction after they have taken their first degree. Laying aside other difficulties, such as the facts that because of difference of age the graduates are not all equally near to the time of their ordination, and that with many it will be an object at once to obtain some remunerative employment, we much doubt whether it is expedient that they should be detained in college another year. We have spoken of the influence which a man or a system may have on a character in the process of formation, and that at one and the same time it is expedient that *one* influence mainly should be brought to bear. But by no means do we imply by this, that at successive periods of life different influences may not work most advantageously. And so, whatever others may say, it is our opinion, that to one who has spent three years and a half at Oxford or Cambridge, the change from the mixed society of the University, its boisterous sports, its unbending rules and regulations, its Proctors, its gate-bills, its wine-parties, to the more quiet but more varied society of a Cathedral city, and the firm but gentler discipline of a Diocesan College, will be singularly advantageous.

Digitized by Google

There are periods of life when we are especially called upon to forget those things which are behind, and look forward to those which are before. But the associations of the University are with the past: even he who has stayed up till forty, fifty, sixty years have passed over his head, thinks of his undergraduate days as *the* days of his University life. The open hearts and warm friendships of those days are most vividly remembered. So we say of the newly-hooded bachelor—the associations of the University are with the past; those of the Diocesan College will be with the future. His schooling ends with the one, his life will begin with the other.

But is there not another class of clergymen which has increased much of late years, to whom the Professors, the Colleges, and associations of the Universities would prove of vast advantage? Is there not a large and increasing body who grudge the four years which must pass over their heads if they graduate at the Universities, and who are therefore compelled to seek for admission at S. Bees' or S. Aidan's? It will not be deemed that we throw slight upon these institutions when we ask, is it likely that the associations with which they are connected will have the same hallowing and mellowing influence on the minds of their students as the buildings, the system, the life of the older Universities would have? For them, therefore, we think it would be as great a boon to be transferred to Oxford or Cambridge, as it would be desirable for graduates of the University to be transferred elsewhere. And the presence of men who had learnt the advantage of business-habits, who had struggled hard through difficulties of circumstances, or of feelings, or of faith, would exercise no prejudicial influence on the feeling and tone of the ancient Universities.[1]

But there is one question more ere we conclude. What is to become of theology in England if they to whom, by their office, we look to be leaders and generals, are employed in the work of training and drilling the soldiers of the line? Nay, we may ask, what has become of theology? The events and progress of the last few years, the opening of the Continent, the spur given to thought which closer contact with the mind of France and Germany has given, place us in a position different from that which was occupied by the English theologians of last century, or of the early part of this. In the meantime, we have most valuable additions to our libraries on points at issue between

[1] The Syndicate, which sat for four years at Cambridge to advise on the change of the statutes of the University, recommended that the degree of Licentiate in Theology should be given to any who entering after a certain age attended lectures for two years, and passed sundry examinations in Theology. The Senate unhappily rejected the proposal.

Digitized by Google

'High Church and Low Church,' such as the volumes of Bethell, Laurence, and others; a few valuable contributions towards the interpretation of Scripture, as the work of Davison; many laboured attempts to solve the mystery of the Apocalypse; but we have no work by a writer of the English Church which we can recommend to a student as the groundwork of his theological reading. If he takes up Tomline, he meets with assertions which he will find flatly denied in the first Westminster Review he may chance to open. What is he to do? The arguments used are new and striking, are stated with an appearance of candour and of confidence. They claim to be old, and never to have been refuted. What is he to believe? Why is this? and how is this? Is it not partly because our leaders despise their adversaries, (always a dangerous thing to do:) partly because they are ignorant how much these sceptical books are read: but mainly because their time and energy is wholly spent in a work which we believe would be done better by others of less ability? If Bishops Turton and Kaye had been called upon to deliver lectures, as Bishop Ollivant and Dr. Jeremie have been, lectures *ad populum*, not *ad clerum*, we should never have had those monuments of calm, clear, convincing reasoning, founded on the products of long study, which, though written for a temporary purpose, have gained a permanent reputation.

We have yet to see whether the lectures delivered under the more recent regulations, will produce such improvement in the character of the Clergy of the country, as will compensate for the serious injury caused by them to the learning of the Church of England. At present we see no signs of it. But the reputation of the Universities in the meantime *has* fallen. It will not be soon forgotten that Oxford put forth as a work of Origen, a volume which a layman and a courtier demonstrated to have been written by Hippolytus. Of the eight Professors who, at the commencement of this year, held the purely Divinity chairs at Oxford and Cambridge, two only are known out of the Universities by their writings; and these writings, valuable as they are, occupy no more than two or three octavo volumes. In the meantime, there is a party, we will not say of learning, but of activity and energy, which has many adherents amongst the medical men and lawyers of the country, who laugh at University orthodoxy and University ignorance; who under this are quietly gaining possession of the ear of one and another of the middle classes, habituating them to the thought that S. John did not write S. John's Gospel, nor S. Paul S. Paul's letters; who perplex and silence far more than they convert. But no notice of these efforts have we found amongst the writings of our Divinity Professors. They have been content to leave such subjects

Digitized by Google

to Dr. Davidson, who is a Dissenter, or Chevalier Bunsen, who is a German!

We have been pleading the cause of Cathedral Colleges, to complete the training for Holy Orders, which the Universities leave incomplete. We have contended that academic lectures give the candidate little education, and senate-house examinations are no sufficient test of his fitness. The majority of our Bishops, unhappily, think differently, and demand the 'voluntary.' We trust that our endeavour to investigate this question will meet with attention amongst those on whom will ultimately depend the success of any effort at improving the tone and preparation of the Clergy; but, in doing this, we feel that we have been pleading the cause of theology and religion itself. On behalf of the candidate we have asked for a better training than the Universities can give. For the officers of our older Colleges we have begged for employment which will elevate and sanctify them; on behalf of another class of men, who are daily rising into greater importance, we have petitioned for a better and more wholesome education than they can have at present; on behalf of the Professors, we have entreated for work congenial to their calling; on behalf of the truth of God, we have prayed that its lustre may not be dimmed by our neglect, nor its lamps quiver and expire for want of the hand to trim. And so we leave the case, entreating our readers not to think that in this matter there can be any real opposition between cathedral-city, and old University, beyond that ever useful rivalry, the provoking to love and to good works. We leave it, humbly praying God that He will bless these and all other means of promoting His kingdom, and spreading His truth, until the time come when labour shall end in rest, and imperfection be lost in glory.

P.S.—Since our remarks have gone to press, the University of Cambridge has adopted the recommendations of a Syndicate appointed to suggest improvements in the theological studies of the University. Henceforth there will be two examinations in each year—at Easter and Michaelmas—the subjects being the following, 'The Historical Books of the Old Testament, the 'Greek Testament, the Articles of Religion and Liturgy of the 'Church of England, the Ecclesiastical History of the First 'Three Centuries, and the History of the Reformation in Eng-'land.' At first sight this list appears tolerably extensive: the subjects may branch out in different directions, and introduce much reading. It will be observed, however, that no knowledge is required of the Septuagint, or Hebrew, and none of *the Psalms or Prophets, even in English.*

Moreover, the Syndicate recommended, and the University

Digitized by Google

decreed, that once in each year there should be an examination for 'honours in Theology;' and 'the candidates for honours shall 'be further examined in the Greek Testament, in assigned por-'tions of the early Fathers, and of the Septuagint version of the 'Old Testament, and assigned works or parts of works of stan-'dard Theological writers.'

To this we know many of our friends object; for our own part we welcomed the announcement, in the hope that it might be the means of introducing many students to some great works, which would lie beyond the range of a Bishop's examination; we shrugged our shoulders at noticing what a favourable opportunity was lost for promoting the study of Hebrew—but, in its stead, we expected reference to the Apostolical Fathers; some treatises say of S. Basil or S. Augustine, amongst the ancients; or, of Bull and Waterland amongst the moderns. Of course, the knowledge of the whole of the Old Testament in the English version, of Butler, Pearson, and Hooker.

The list was published about Dec. 21. It contains—

'Septuagint: Book of Genesis.'

'The assigned portions of the early Fathers' *is* (we beg pardon for our English)—

'*The First Epistle of Clemens Romanus.*

'The assigned works, or parts of works of standard Theological writers,' *are*—

'Butler's Analogy. Part I.
Pearson on Creed. Art. II.
Paley's Horæ Paulinæ. *Introductory Chapter, and Chapter on the Epistle to the Romans.*'

We would now ask Dr. Heurtley, who are they that are lowering the tone of Theology? who that are endeavouring to raise it?

Digitized by Google

NOTICES.

THE form in which the well-known Irish ecclesiastical historian, Mr. Robert King, Diocesan Curate, Armagh, has published his 'Memoir introductory to the Early History of the Primacy of Armagh,' (Armagh: John Thompson, 1854,) is curiously illustrative of the amount of encouragement which, with all the national pretensions, is given in Ireland to undertakings of real research. Despairing of being able to produce the work in an independent form, Mr. King had recourse to the columns of a friendly local newspaper, which not only published it by divisions, but worked off a small folio sheet week by week, without which assistance the treatise could not have appeared. We must add, that the tone of the dedication points to further efficacious aid afforded by the present munificent occupant of the primatial see. The results which Mr. King considers he has arrived at are, 'that while no other form of *ordination* except the episcopal 'was known or heard of in Ireland in the early ages, (from the first 'preaching, in fact, of Christianity in the island to the period of the British 'Reformation,) yet no *diocesan* episcopacy was settled in this country, or 'employed for the *government* of the Irish Church, until introduced by the 'Church of Rome in the twelfth century;' and that accordingly, on the one hand, there were administrators of Church government in the persons of the abbots of certain monasteries, deriving their importance as, and entitled, successors of early saints, founders of those Churches; and, on the other, there were bishops, ordainers of the clergy, who might or who might not be these abbots, but who as bishops had no territorial jurisdiction, or settled limits of episcopal action. Every tyro in Church history is aware that Venerable Bede mentions this anomaly as characteristic of the Culdee monastery of Iona, founded by S. Columba, and that Presbyterian controversialists have not scrupled to distort it in favour of their system. Mr. King contends that the anomaly in question was not confined to Iona only, but was the practice of all the Irish Churches till the time of Maolmogue O'Morgan, better known as St. Malveley. Accordingly, he states that the prelates of Armagh up to this date were not properly archbishops at all, but abbots, who as '*loarbs*,' or successors of S. Patrick, held the first place in the Irish Church, but who were very far from universally being invested with the episcopal order. S. Bernard, it is well known, complains bitterly of the usurpation of the see of Armagh by monied and unordained persons. It would follow from Mr. King's theory, that the latter portion of the complaint, with which all must sympathise, was not so much a corruption introduced into the see of Armagh, as a state of normal imperfection pervading the entire community. It must be noted that celibacy does not seem to contribute an essential qualification for an early Irish abbot. We commend this very curious portion of ecclesiastical history to the attentive examination of studious theologians. Mr. Petrie has shown how rich a field of ecclesiological research exists in the præ-Roman ecclesiastical buildings of Ireland. A parallel line of study offers itself in the documentary annals of early Irish Church polity.

Digitized by Google

'Heartsease; or, the Brother's Wife.' (J. W. Parker.) A new work from the pen of the authoress of the 'Heir of Redclyffe' is certain of a reception almost too cordial for its best interests. Its predecessor secures it a warm welcome, at the expense of a high reputation to keep up, and raised expectations to satisfy. How far the admirers of the pure chastened tone of romance in the 'Heir of Redclyffe,' with its chivalrous hero and superlative heroine—evidently darling conceptions of the writer—will find their anticipations met by the more ordinary group of characters, whose fortunes are the subject of the present story, may be doubted. But 'Heartsease' deserves to be judged on its own merits. It is a tale full of interest, with scenes as vivid, though not so highly wrought, as the last. The story is new in its plan, and well sustained; the characters for the most part natural, and acting well upon one another; the dialogue, as always with this writer, animated and clever. The interest perhaps too much centres in the heroine; but she is a very real and sweet person, and her attractions so genuine, that we see nothing improbable in the extent of good which her modest gifts and graces achieve, while whatever is painful in her position may be regarded as necessary to the moral of a marriage like hers, with which the story opens. Theodora, the sister-in-law, in whose delineation great pains and almost too much space are bestowed, we cannot think so successful. In the necessity of inventing trials for the heroine, she is made too faulty either for nature or any share in the reader's sympathy, who cannot see sufficient reason for her vagaries in her jealousy of the affection of a very common-place brother. She is, however, a favourite with the writer, and the occasion of many striking scenes. The sketch of Theresa Marstone is so good, that we were disappointed not to see more of her. There is in our authoress a rectitude and clear-sightedness in matters of right and wrong, which qualify her to unmask pretension, and to expose the fallacies by which some high religious professors seem to hold themselves exempt from the common rules of honesty and conscience. One word of criticism we are tempted to offer, which applies indiscriminately to all stories by this writer: we mean the undue prominence of physical suffering. Casualties, accidents, sudden deaths, lingering sicknesses, all forms of pain and bodily weakness, are used too much as engines to excite sympathy, and for the sake of incident. Probably the invention will fasten on these obvious stimulants to interest and excitement; but it is not the less a fault to be guarded against. Not that the present tale is at all an extreme case, only a general delicacy of constitution pervades the *dramatis personæ*, and Violet suffers from an habitual languor, bordering upon hysteria. We doubt, by the way, if it is fair to husbands to represent wives as a sort of fragile ware, which will break and slip through their fingers unless constantly nursed and guarded. A man may be a good husband, we plead, and yet so indifferent a nurse, that he must trust his wife to the management of her own health: but we speak under correction. Perhaps the direct religious tendency of this story is not so prominent as in the 'Heir of Redclyffe;' but there is enough to show how habitually the writer is directed by the highest rules of action, and to lead the reader's thoughts on to the true source and example of all excellence.

Digitized by Google

We noticed last quarter a 'Letter to Mr. Dale' by Mr. Millner, incumbent of one of the district churches of S. Pancras, intimating an opinion that it revealed a state of things the existence of which it would be well in those most concerned to disprove. These are the abuses—and a kindred one exists in Cripplegate—which will ruin Chapters, that of S. Paul's in particular. Not only does the charge remain unanswered, but it has recently been restated, and the unfortunate condition of this immense parish more pointedly brought out, in 'An Appeal to the Bishop of London, by a District Churchwarden.' (Darling.) S. Pancras is in ecclesiastical matters governed by a strange body of trustees, the messenger and clerk of whom, it seems, is better paid than nine Clergymen out of ten in the parish. The Churchwarden states, which seems extraordinary, that Mr. Millner's printed letter was answered by Mr. Dale, 'in the pulpit of S. Pancras church.'—P. 7.

'The Bishop of Winchester on Convocation,' is the reprint of an article which appeared in the *Ecclesiastic and Theologian* for October. (Masters.) It is written in very vigorous, and, as it is called, strong language; not stronger, we are sorry to say, than the occasion—a distressing one—warrants.

Mr. W. Rogers, in his 'Educational Prospects of S. Thomas, Charterhouse,' (Longman,) prints a pamphlet in the shape of a Letter to Lord John Russell, showing how his large and important schools have brought him into pecuniary distress and trouble. The experience of every 'new district,' especially in London, confirms Mr. Rogers' statement. As a mere matter of taste, we are not very partial to specimens of ministerial autobiography, and successes, and sacrifices; but Mr. Rogers tells his in a lively way.

Mr. Biden, the author of a work called 'Truths Maintained,' and 'The Church and her Destinies,' (Aylott and Jones,) seems very anxious that we should give an opinion on his productions. He has, he tells us, acquired 'one great fundamental truth, viz. that the past of Christianity, from soon 'after its first promulgation, has been at variance with the Gospel—the 'whole machinery of an ecclesiastical Church is inappropriate, and the whole 'body of doctrines taught false.' As to 'Truths Maintained,' the author assures us that it has done its work; 'by its aid the devil is bound for a thousand years,' p. 54, an intimation which is hardly reconcilable with Mr. James Biden's subsequent complaint, which some people will be old-fashioned enough to consider a little blasphemous, (Appendix, p. 79,) 'that 'the author has been specially called to God's service, and has now been 'steadily employed six years—the six working-days—apparently with 'little result upon the opinions held in Christendom.'

'The Castle Builders' is a reprint by Miss Young, the authoress of the 'Heir of Redclyffe,' of a tale which has appeared in Mr. Mozley's excellent magazine, 'The Monthly Packet.' We are not sure that a smaller canvass does not suit this writer better than a large one. Her skill is rather in the delicate elaboration of character than in plot. For single pathetic scenes, such as the drowning of the noble boy Frank, she stands very high; it will quite bear comparison with the wonderful sea-side inci-

Digitized by Google

dent in the 'Antiquary.' We should be glad that the characters were not so exclusively high-born and high-bred: and speaking generally, at least from our own experience of school-boys and school-girls, the intellectual powers, as well as the acquirements, of her young people are in advance of their years.

It is satisfactory to find so many of our Bishops issuing with authority, Prayers for private use, with especial reference to the War. Foremost both as regards completeness, and what used to be called unction, stands a collection, quite a manual, under the Bishop of Oxford's *imprimatur*, 'Prayers to be used during our present Troubles.' (J. H. Parker.) The Collect 'for our allies' might with advantage have specially distinguished the Turks, and then of course it would have referred to their conversion.

Professor Ansted has printed, and Mr. Van Voorst has published, under the title of 'Scenery, Science, and Artist,' some notes of various mining districts in the south of France, Spain, Algeria, Sardinia, and North America. The writer has qualifications beyond the technical requisites of his profession; he is a very good describer of natural scenery, and in the Sardinian notes he travels over a country as little known to the run of travellers as the African Desert.

The provincial dialects of England are much misunderstood if they are only considered an illiterate and barbarous *patois*. In fact, they contain and preserve the elements and rudiments of our compound tongue. In Miss Baker's admirable 'Northamptonshire Glossary,' (J. Russell Smith,) we have rather a repertory of archaisms than vulgarisms. But it is much more than a vocabulary; it preserves not only dialectical peculiarities, but old and disappearing customs, and there is hardly a page in it which does not illustrate some detail of 'Folk Lore,' or which does not throw light on some obscurity in our old writers, or recal old habits and practices. We extract a curious article:—

'FIG SUNDAY.—Palm Sunday. It is the universal custom, with both 'rich and poor in Northamptonshire, to eat figs on this day. On the Satur-'day preceding, the market at Northampton is abundantly supplied with 'figs, and there are more purchased at this time than throughout the rest of 'the year; even the charity children are in some places regaled with them. 'The observance of this custom is very local . . . may it not have some 'reference to our Lord's declining to eat figs the day after His triumphant 'entry into Jerusalem?'—Vol. i. p. 232. The fault of this work is that it gives much more than it promises; like Pegge's well-known book it treats of colloquialisms, and the ordinary proverbial expressions, which are in no sense local. For instance, 'pot-luck' is not a localism, and occasionally we should demur to the interpretation. The cant phrase to 'cut your stick,' Miss Baker connects with the Exchequer tallies; surely it is nothing more than a metaphorical expression of going on a journey, and preparing a staff for it. Miss Baker is the sister of the late historian of the county, and distinguished herself long before 'ecclesiology' became popular, by a very practical restoration of the sculptures of S. Peter's, Northampton, executed by her own hands.

Sympathising to the full with the practical pamphlet by 'A Layman,'

Digitized by Google

on 'The Late Payment of Weekly Wages,' (Rivingtons,) we can only say that our inquiries tend to the unsatisfactory conviction, that if wages are paid on Friday, the Saturday is lost; if on Monday, the week is broken. The present writer's opposite experience is drawn chiefly from the more respectable class of artisans employed in a printing-office.

Certainly Mr. Murray's little red *feuilletons* of Railway Reading are adapted to all tastes; the two last instalments are about as opposite as can be conceived:—'The Rejected Addresses,' illustrated by a perfect apparatus of illustrative notes, gay, lively, and sparkling: and Mr. Henry Taylor's well-known 'Six Essays,' grave, thoughtful, and austere. In the last collection we have read with increased delight that most able paper on 'Choice in Marriage:' it is the very best extant 'advice to those about to marry.'

'The Bishop of Oxford's Charge,' (J. W. Parker,) is probably in the hands of most of our readers. Eulogy on our part would be unbecoming, but we desire to enrich our pages with an extract which immediate circumstances invest with great importance:—

'The teaching of the Church of England, then, as to this great mystery, 'in strict agreement with the Holy Scriptures and primitive antiquity, is, 'I apprehend, simply this. First, that there is a peculiar and supernatural 'presence of Christ with His people in that Holy Sacrament. That in it 'He does in and by the due reception of the consecrated elements convey 'to the faithful believer a real partaking of His body and of His blood, 'whereby the souls of His faithful people are nourished and refreshed. 'But, secondly, that He has not revealed to us the mode or conditions of 'that presence; which, being Divine and supernatural, is not to be thought 'of, or made the subject of argument, as if it either were governed by the 'laws, or involved the consequences of a material presence. To the many 'questions, therefore, which may be raised touching the conditions, or 'mode of this presence, our Church gives no answer; but protests against 'their discussion as being curious and dangerous; as being likely to lead, 'and as having led those who entertained them, into many errors; and as, 'therefore, to be discouraged as attempts to be wise above what is written. 'As to one of these, indeed, because it specially threatened the faith of her 'own children, she has pronounced a distinct and emphatic censure; con-'demning the Papal solution of the mystery in terms which apply to it 'alike in its grosser form of an undisguised belief in the transformation of 'the bread and wine into flesh and blood, and in that subtle refinement of 'the fancy, whereby—whilst the theory of a material change is still pre-'served—its grossness is veiled, for more educated intellects, by the de-'claration, that the substances of the bread and wine, in their highest 'essential being, are removed, and for them miraculously substituted the 'essential substance of our Lord's body, whilst the accidents of that 'altered substance, such as taste, colour, shape, and the like, remain, 'through God's power, unchanged, so as to delude the senses. This 'doctrine of Transubstantiation,—the fruitful source, or apt ally, in the 'Papal communion of so many and such dangerous superstitions,—our 'Church condemns in no faltering accents, as being unknown to primitive 'times, incapable of proof by the Holy Writ, but repugnant to the plain

Digitized by Google

'words of Scripture, as overthrowing the nature of a sacrament, and 'having given occasion to many superstitions. But this direct condemna- 'tion of the teachers of error is not her common course. Rather, for the 'most part, has she guarded the faith by a simple denial of the erroneous 'doctrine, or even by asserting, with authority, the distinct truth, which 'those who have maintained the error she condemns, have endeavoured to 'disfigure, or deny. Thus in declaring, that "to such as rightly, worthily, 'and with faith, partake of that sacrament, the bread which we break, is 'a partaking of the body of Christ; and likewise the cup of blessing, is 'a partaking of the blood of Christ." And again, "that the body and 'blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in 'the Lord's Supper;" and again, that "the wicked do not therein partake 'of Christ;" and once more, "that the body of Christ is given, taken, and 'eaten in the Supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner;" she 'asserts those truths which are darkened by the confusing and erroneous 'doctrine of Consubstantiation, and denied by the cold naturalism of the 'Zuinglian theory, which resolves the reality of Christ's presence into the 'quickened apprehension of the devout worshipper; but whilst she has 'thus authoritatively reasserted the truths which were in peril, she has 'not stepped aside to censure by name either the one error or the other.

'This, then, being so, we may, I think, without difficulty, gather what 'should be our teaching as to this great mystery.

'We should first, and above all, in opposition to the unbelief which is so 'natural to the heart of man, insist upon the reality and truth of that super- 'natural presence which our Lord is graciously pleased to vouchsafe in that 'Sacrament to the worthy receiver. Next, we should discourage, to the 'utmost of our power, all speculations as to the mode of that presence, the 'reality of which we inculcate. Further, whilst we should distinctly con- 'demn every specific form of erroneous teaching, concerning the mode of 'that presence, which our Church has actually censured, we should watch 'against that dogmatical spirit which would lead us to anathematize all 'with whose statements ours do not exactly harmonize; remembering the 'moderation and wisdom which has led our Church to seek to maintain 'undefiled the purity of the Faith, by an unreserved and uncompromising 'reassertion of the truth which heresy assails, rather than by a direct con- 'demnation of the holders of error; and being on our guard lest we be 'rashly led, on the mere strength of our individual judgment, to multiply 'censures which she has advisedly withheld. Lastly, we should labour to 'lead our people from curious questions as to that which is eminently a 'mystery, to be received simply by faith, and not argued out by the sub- 'tlety of reasoning, to an humble and unquestioning belief in the working 'of the Power of God, and to earnest longings for the great spiritual bless- 'ings, which, if they come aright, will be vouchsafed to them in thus par- 'taking of Christ. And if at any time we are forced to enter further upon 'this mystery, we should keep as closely as possible to the letter of Scrip- 'ture, and to the inculcation of the doctrine as a revealed fact in its bearing 'upon practice; remembering, what is admitted even by Bellarmine, "that 'though it is a matter of faith to believe that Sacraments are instruments 'whereby God worketh grace in the souls of men, yet that the manner how

Digitized by Google

'He doth it, is not a matter of faith." Surely, to turn our own minds, or 'the minds of our people, to such inquiries, instead of seeking simply that 'nourishment of our souls which the Lord is then imparting to us, is as if 'they whose bodies He was graciously feeding in the wilderness with the 'broken bread and the distributed fishes, had turned aside from that pro- 'vision which He was making for their need, in order to ascertain whether, 'at the time of blessing, or in the breaking, or the giving, or the receiving, 'was vouchsafed the multiplication of the loaves and of the fishes; on which, 'instead, it was their wisdom and their duty thankfully to feed.

'Thus, for example, instead of speculating upon what is received by the 'unfaithful in the Lord's Supper, or dogmatizing thereon as to what may 'seem to some to be infallible inferences with regard to a matter on which 'Holy Scripture is well nigh silent, and as to which, if the presence be, as 'we undoubtedly believe it is, indeed immaterial, we have no data for con- 'structing an argument, we should remember that, though our Lord's pro- 'mise is sure, and though, therefore, where the whole appointed rite is 'duly performed in all its parts, including equally the consecration of the 'elements, and their faithful reception, the presence of the body and blood 'of Christ are certain to the faithful receiver, yet that we have no right to 'stop after the prayer of consecration, or at any other intermediate point 'in that which by the Lord's appointment is one undivided whole, and to 'argue that at that time, that Divine Presence must have been granted, 'which is promised only to the act of duly giving and receiving, and not to 'any of its several parts. We shall, therefore, do well, as to this myste- 'rious matter, to confine ourselves to asserting with our Church, that the 'ungodly are, in partaking of the consecrated elements, "in nowise par- 'takers of Christ," and yet, that, in eating that bread and drinking of that 'cup unworthily, they partake not of common food, but, as our Church 'teaches again, "to their own condemnation do herein eat and drink the 'sign or sacrament of so great a thing," as the Body of the Lord, and do 'that, for the doing of which of old many of the Corinthian Christians were '"weak and sickly, yea, and many slept."'

A cloud of little 'Classic Texts,' from Mr. J. H. Parker's accurate press, meets us. They are suited for school and college lectures; and are as portable and as neat as the Elzevirs. It must have been by a prolepsis of this series, that Parson Adams is said to have carried Æschylus in his pocket.

The valuable and varied collection, published under Mr. Wm. Jackson's editorship, 'Stories and Catechisings on the Collects,' has been followed by a cognate collection of 'Stories and Lessons on the Catechism.' (Mozley.) It is a problem how to connect dogmatic instruction with narrative: very generally the latter is an imposition if the former is faithful. To say that Mr. Jackson, or the authoress who writes under his sponsorship, has in all cases surmounted the difficulty, would be an exaggeration of praise: but it is met, and generally surmounted. The Stories, we have reason to know, work well: and this is the best or only test.

Mr. R. H. Graves, an Irish Clergyman, has published an analysis of Mede's well-known work on the Apocalypse, under the title of 'An Analysis

Digitized by Google

of the Revelations.' (Hodges & Smith.) The author was not called upon to miscall one of the Books of the Bible.

Archdeacon Denison, in the preface to a characteristic and warm-hearted sermon, lately preached at Wells, on the 5th November, (Masters,) has set down the exact state of the case between Mr. Ditcher and himself. We extract it in the Archdeacon's own words:—

'The Commission has been issued, bearing date "Lambeth, November 30." It is to sit at Clevedon, January 3, 1855.

'That there may be no room for dispute as to the fact of the present assault being directed against THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER, I subjoin the charge against me, in its eight Counts. I am charged with maintaining false Doctrine under *all* the eight counts.

'CHARGE.

'1. That the Body and Blood of CHRIST, being Really Present, after an immaterial and spiritual manner, in the consecrated bread and wine, are therein and thereby given to all, and are received by all who come to the LORD'S Table.

'2. That to all who come to the LORD'S Table, to those who eat and drink worthily, and to those who eat and drink unworthily, the Body and Blood of CHRIST are given, and that by all who come to the LORD'S Table, by those who eat and drink worthily, and by those who eat and drink unworthily, the Body and Blood of CHRIST are received.

'3. That the universal reception of the inward part or Thing signified, of the Sacrament, in and by the outward sign, is a part of the doctrine of the Real Presence itself.

'4. That worship is due to the Real though invisible and supernatural Presence of the Body and Blood of CHRIST in the Holy Eucharist "under the form of bread and wine."

'5. That the act of Consecration makes the Real Presence.

'6. That the act of Consecration makes the Sacrament, through the operation of THE HOLY GHOST, to be CHRIST'S Body and Blood.

'7. That in the LORD'S Supper the outward parts or signs, and the inward parts or Things signified, are so joined together by the act of Consecration, that to receive the one is to receive the other.

'8. That all who receive the Sacrament of the LORD'S Supper receive the Body and Blood of CHRIST.

'All which said Positions or Doctrines I, the said Reverend Joseph Ditcher, do further expressly charge and complain to be directly contrary or repugnant to the Doctrine of the Church of England, and especially to the Articles of Religion as by Law established, or some or one of them.

'N.B.—With reference to the language of Counts 1 and 3, I have to observe, that being advised, after Sermon I. was published, that the use of the word "*is*," in this context might appear to some to savour of a belief in *some material* Presence, I carefully avoided the use of the word "in" in the same context in Sermons II. and III., and in my VIII. Propositions. It is used, indeed, in the Preface to Sermon II., but here only because I was quoting statements previously made, and answering objections taken to such statements.

'I was ready to have given the above explanation, if, in answer to my

Digitized by Google

'letter of April 20, 1854, to the late Bishop of Bath and Wells, (See Correspondence, pp. 10, 11,) I had been allowed an opportunity of offering 'explanation respecting *the manner of my teaching*.

'This, then, is THE DOCTRINE,—Scriptural, Primitive, Catholic, Anglican, '—held, unconsciously, perhaps, and without examination of terms, but 'firmly, deeply, universally, so to speak, by the poor and simple-minded 'of GOD'S Church in this land,—this is THE DOCTRINE for teaching which 'it is now sought to *deprive* me, after a ministry of more than twenty years '—upon which, from its commencement to this day, it is not possible to 'fasten any charge of unfaithfulness to the Church of England, under 13th 'Eliz., as a depraver of the XXXIX Articles, or some one or more of them.

'If the present case shall find its way into Court, it appears scarcely 'possible—having regard to the accumulation of evidence—that any judg-'ment can be given against me; or, if so given, can be confirmed upon appeal. 'But it is well to be prepared for the worst; and I think it due to the 'Church at large to state here the course which, in that event, I am pre-'pared to take.

'Having been deprived of my *temporalities*, as a teacher of false doctrine, 'by sentence of Court of Appeal, I shall appeal, touching THE DOCTRINE 'so condemned, *first*, to the Bishops of the Church at home, assembled in 'Convocation. If, unhappily, my appeal be by them either refused, or be 'entertained with an adverse issue, I shall *further* appeal to all the Bishops 'of the Anglican Communion. (Vide Preface to Sermon I. p. 6.)

'I reprint here the Propositions published by me March 22, 1854, being 'a condensed and formal statement, under eight heads, of what I had 'affirmed and proved in Sermons I. and II.

'I have set out below, in VIII. Propositions, THE DOCTRINE OF THE 'HOLY EUCHARIST maintained in my two published Sermons, intituled '"THE REAL PRESENCE."

'I maintain this DOCTRINE. I have not anywhere, at any time, main-'tained any other DOCTRINE.

'I. That the Bread and Wine become, by the act of Consecration, "the 'outward part or sign of the LORD'S Supper:" and, considered as objects 'of sense, are unchanged by the act of Consecration; "remaining still in 'their very natural substances."

'II. That "the inward part or THING signified," is "the BODY and BLOOD 'of CHRIST."

'III. That "the BODY and BLOOD of CHRIST," being Present naturally 'in Heaven, are, supernaturally and invisibly, but Really, Present in the 'LORD'S Supper, through the elements, by virtue of the act of Consecration.

'IV. That by "the Real Presence of the BODY and BLOOD of CHRIST in 'the LORD'S Supper," is not to be understood the presence of an Influence 'emanating from a THING absent, but the supernatural and invisible 'Presence of a THING Present; of HIS very BODY and very BLOOD, Present '"under the form of Bread and Wine."

'V. That the "outward part or sign," and "the inward part or THING 'signified," being brought together in and by the act of Consecration, *make* 'THE SACRAMENT.

'VI. That THE SACRAMENT—*i.e.* "the outward part or sign"—and "the

Digitized by Google

'inward part, or THING signified"—is given to, and is received by, all who 'communicate.

'VII. That "in such only as worthily receive the same [THE SACRA-'MENTS of the BODY and the BLOOD of CHRIST] they have a wholesome 'effect or operation; but they that receive them unworthily purchase to 'themselves damnation, as S. Paul saith."

'VIII. That worship is due to "the BODY and BLOOD of CHRIST," 'supernaturally and invisibly, but Really, Present in the LORD'S Supper, '"under the form of Bread and Wine," by reason of that GODHEAD with 'which THEY are Personally united. But that the elements, through which '"the BODY and BLOOD of CHRIST" are given and received, may not be 'worshipped.'

In connexion with this subject, we are informed that an important pamphlet, 'On Article XXIX.' by Mr.Grueber, (Masters,) deserves a very attentive and careful perusal. By some accident, it has not reached us; but it is said to be very carefully written.

Mr. Gresley's 'Sermon on the Unity of the Church,' (Masters,) proves that he is now as ever ready on any emergency to issue one of his manly, sensible, and well-timed appeals to our patience and consistency.

And this sermon in its occasional propriety reminds us to acknowledge Mr. R. I. Wilberforce's work 'On the Royal Supremacy,' (Longman,) and to observe, which is all that at present we are called upon to say, that it reproduces, with little or no novelty of argument, a position, the settlement of which we had always considered to lie at the very threshold of communion with the Church of England. Mr. Wilberforce's assumption is, that all theology and ecclesiastical *status* must admit of a sharp, formal, logical, and almost mathematical symmetry and completeness. Unless it exhausts every difficulty, it confesses not only a weakness but a vice. The Church of England has its logical difficulties: the Church of Rome professes a completeness. The consequence is, that the formal claimant, because it demands, must receive our allegiance.

We welcome Mr. Newland's little volume of Sermons, which he calls 'Postils.' (Masters.) The thought is a happy one to work out patristic teaching into sensible idiomatic English. The preacher's object has been rather to convey the spirit and method than the words and style of the ancient and authoritative Doctors. In a very unassuming preface, Mr. Newland desires not to take credit for learning which he does not possess. But if he has read little he has read well. And we only repeat the experience of others when we say, that better sermon-thoughts are to be gathered from these ancient sources than from any conceivable or unconceivable perusal of Scott and Henry.

Mr F. Meyrick has printed at the Vice-Chancellor's request, 'Two Sermons preached before the University of Oxford on 29th May, and 5th November.' (J. H. Parker.) They exhibit that same loving spirit, to the furtherance of which Mr. Meyrick's many and useful labours have been directed. The preacher does justice to those who, among ourselves, teach differently from himself; we should be glad to have fuller evidence that this meekness and charity were in any degree reciprocated.

Digitized by Google

THE

CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

APRIL, 1855.

ART. I. — *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman, depuis son Origine jusqu'à nos Jours. Par* J. DE HAMMER. *Traduit de l'Allemand sur les Notes et sous la Direction de l'Auteur. Par* J. J. HELLERT. 18 vols. 8vo. Paris, 1835—1843.

THE Ottomans were the last of those conquering races who, during the middle ages, broke into Europe, and fixed the present arrangement of its map; and the Ottoman State may be said to be, with one partial exception, the last great territorial conquest made in Europe. Never assimilating to those whom they had conquered, and but imperfectly able to incorporate their subjects with themselves, divided by what seems an eternal bar from the fellowship of other European nations, the Ottomans, in the period of their prosperity and strength, afflicted Europe with incessant and singularly terrible warfare; and long after they had learned not to be ambitious, insulted it with their domestic ferocity and untamed barbarian pride. The curse which they had brought with them clings to their presence still, in the hour of their deep decay. By the very decline of their power, jealousies have been awakened which could not be appeased, and questions raised which could not be solved, without plunging Europe into a war, of which no one can forecast the issues. At a moment like the present,[1] when, while verging to their fall, they have once more become the occasion of calamity to Christendom, it may not be without interest to recal briefly the steps by which they arose from the most insignificant beginnings to their eventful eminence.

The history of the early Ottomans has been very imperfectly told, and much still remains dark and uncertain in the features which distinguish in its origin that strange and mighty race from its kindred tribes. It is a history, in the main, of wasteful and unscrupulous conquest, like that of other successful barbarians of Europe and Asia. But we seem to discern, even

[1] The following pages were in type in December 1854.

Digitized by Google

from the beginning, some points of special interest. We seem to perceive in it the remarkable history of a single family, gradually gathering round itself the materials of a vast ambition, and shaping a people and a nation to support it, out of heterogeneous elements, by the informing power and spirit of one household and line. It is an advance of which the earlier steps were as slow and gradual as its subsequent strides suddenly became gigantic. It is a story of great patience and resolution; of an ambition, which, unlike that of most barbarians, was not in a hurry, but could keep its object in view and devise the means for its achievement without restlessness and without weariness. It was content to work by degrees, and, without losing sight of the highest prizes, was satisfied with smaller ones, while they were proportionate to its strength. And among the institutions of which the foundations were early laid, as the permanent supports of the greatness which it meditated, one was at once the most original, the most terrible, and, for the time, the most effective that is to be found recorded among the inventions of deep craft and heartless love of power, of which history is full. The Ottomans found the art of borrowing their strength systematically, and from the very first, from the races they were subduing; of forcing into their own service, and moulding to their own purpose, the promise and energy which was their natural antagonist. Their history is one at first of few disasters, so cautious and so steadily provident, even while they were most enterprising, were these builders of a new empire. A reverse did come at length, unexpected and crushing. It retarded for some score of years their ambition; but it neither broke up their institutions, nor dismayed their spirit, nor turned aside their purposes, nor in the end crippled their power. It is a painful, but it is an instructive lesson, to compare their stout and persevering course, so wisely compliant to circumstances, but so inflexible in its ultimate direction, their imperious and exacting urgency in the opportunities of success, their self-restraint when it was the time to wait or pause, with the short-sightedness, the despair, the worn-out and spiritless imbecility, the random efforts, of those whom they were menacing. Thus, at length, Christianity was beaten down, the remains of ancient civilization swept away, and the seed and promise of that to come destroyed, not by a passing burst of barbarian ravage, but by a polity new and uncongenial to Europe, which had early attained its maturity and secured its permanence; religious in its groundwork of ideas and laws, with a religion bitterly hostile to all that is sacred in Europe; purely and fixedly military, in its organization and aims, as well as its spirit and habits. No glimmering of political life or thought, no dim image of civil

Digitized by Google

rights or duties, ever gave hope, while the Ottomans were rising to greatness, that they would gradually open, from the tastes and tempers of their ancestral deserts, to the gentler manners, the wider thoughts, the nobler pursuits, the wiser and more equal laws, by which alone nations can be preserved from corruption and decay. There was no germ of improvement in their institutions; yet they succeeded in raising on those institutions a great monarchy, which with all its inherent seeds of ruin, has already stood the wear of four centuries.

In the following pages we shall confine ourselves to that period of their history during which they were preparing for their future greatness,—the period from their first appearance on the outskirts of the Greek empire, till they felt themselves ready to take the great step, for which they had so steadily been preparing, and claim the imperial city, round whose walls they had been closing for more than a century. Our chief guide, as he probably must be of most who study Ottoman history for some time to come, will be Von Hammer. His diffuse and ponderous, yet noble work, is the production of a scholar, a diplomatist, and a traveller, who for thirty years prepared himself for his task by an unwearied study, both of the people whose history he meant to write, and of the original monuments of that history. None but he has yet examined, systematically and critically, the Ottoman records. He ransacked the libraries of Europe from Naples to Oxford; he was able to command the use of the archives of those powers which had most connexion with the Porte, at Vienna and Venice; his agents searched for manuscripts in Cairo and Bagdad, Aleppo and Damascus. Of his absolute success, few probably in the West can be competent to judge; and few are likely to qualify themselves for testing his accuracy, by invading once more that strange mass of semi-barbarous literature, Turkish, Persian, Arabic, only existing in manuscript, and dispersed in distant libraries, from which he drew his materials. We must take on trust his reports of Turkish authorities.[1] In the early part of the history, though they are not absolutely wanting, they furnish, even according to his estimate of them, but scanty and uncertain light: but it is all we have, to check the evidence, perhaps even less to be relied on, of the Greeks. But it is necessary, in accepting the testimony of Ottoman historians,[1] to remember the criticism of Seadeddin, one of the

[1] The earliest sources of Ottoman history to which Von Hammer could get access in the originals, and which he used, are as follows:—

1. The History of *Aaschik-Paschazade*. The writer was a witness of Amurath II.'s Hungarian war in 1438 (*Von Hammer*, i. 345, and *infra*, p. 294), and wrote under Bajazet II., the son of Mahomet the Conqueror, (1481—1512.) He 'drew materials from the Book of Sheikh Yachshi, the Imam of Sultan Orchan, (1325—1359,) (one of the seven who attended Othman's death-bed, *Von Hammer*, i. 86,) who relates

Digitized by Google

most famous of their number, on his predecessor, Idris, whose 'Eight Paradises' he eulogizes and copies, but of whom he remarks, 'that he is too concise in enumerating the virtues of 'the Ottomans, and does not set forth, with the copiousness and 'particularity which they deserve, the praises of the Sultans.' Yet the historian, whose almost only fault is said to be the niggardness of his eulogy, opens his work with claiming it as his merit, that all that is not to the credit of his race, he is most careful to pass over in silence, and that he will only admit posterity to the knowledge of the noble deeds of the house of Othman. It is a partial compensation that his standard of the blameworthy and the honourable is an eastern one; and he records without a remark, and of course without a shadow of censure, the murder of an aged uncle, who was pleading against an aggressive war with the Christians, by the first founder of the race.

We have prefixed to this article the French translation of Von Hammer, to have the opportunity of giving the caution, that it is not to be trusted. It is to be regretted that this handsome and complete book, which contains at full length all Von Hammer's illustrative extracts and documents, and a useful atlas of maps and plans, should have been prepared, as far as the translator's work is concerned, with such inexcusable ignorance

---

the earliest events of Ottoman history from the mouth of his father.' It was a forgotten book to the Ottomans in the 17th century. Von Hammer searched for it in vain at Constantinople; but found it, and made extracts from it, in the Vatican.

2. An old chronicle, by Ali Osman, reaching down to 1470. It had been brought to Europe by Veranzius, and used by Leunclavius.

3. 'View of the World,' by *Neschri*, a contemporary of Aashik-Paschazade under Bajazet II. 'Written in rough Turkish, simply and without art.' Also used by Leunclavius.

4. The 'Eight Paradises' of *Idris* of Bitlis, who died 1523, and who, at the instance of Bajazet II., wrote in Persian the first Ottoman history with attention to elegance of style. Seaddedin regrets in him his extreme luxuriance of diction. What that must have been, may be imagined, from the *soberer* critic's language, who describes the work as 'veiled in musk;' as 'a resplendent beauty among all the brides of the library,' whose 'musk-perfumed hair, that is, the interlacing lines of its letters, is like the locks of the Houris,' and 'whose face is painted with vermilion, that is, it is plentifully interspersed with the texts of the Koran written in red ink.' Von Hammer procured it with difficulty.

5. History of *Lutfi-Pascha*, down to 1553. He had been Grand Vizier.

6. History of *Djemali*, down to 1550. Brought to Vienna in 1551, and translated by Leunclavius. 'The first trustworthy foundation of Ottoman history in Europe.'

7. 'The Crown of Histories' of *Seaddedin*, the first official historiographer of the Ottoman sultans, under Amurath III. (1574-95.) Seaddedin was tutor to the princes, judge of the army, and at last Mufti. Translated, but carelessly, by Bratutti.

8. History of *Aali*, to 1597, 'uncritical, but painstaking and impartial, and not written in an official spirit.'

Thus the earliest Turkish historian cited by Von Hammer *wrote* after the Conquest. With these materials in his hands, instead of in those of Cantemir, we feel our footing more secure; but, after all, Gibbon's remark about Cantemir involuntarily recurs, that 'he gives a miserable idea of his Turkish guides.'

Digitized by Google

or negligence. The continual and stupid mistakes which recur in this neat and flowery French version of Von Hammer's ungainly but vigorous German, negative, to our mind, the assertion in the title-page, that it was translated 'under the direction of the author.' We cannot doubt that Von Hammer understood French. We are certain that the French which is put in his mouth by his translator, working, as he says, 'under his direction,' makes him perpetually say the exact opposite of what he says himself, in German.[1]

The traveller in Asia Minor comes from time to time upon encampments of Turkomans, such as have for the last 1,000 years roamed with their horses and their flocks over the provinces of the East. These wandering shepherds still adhere to the life which their fathers led, in the steppes and highlands of Central Asia. They pitch their black tents in the plains and near the cities during the winter; as the summer draws on, they retire to the coolness and fresh springs of the mountain pastures. They can live contented with this vagrant liberty; but they are ever ready to mount and ride, at a moment's warning, to any call to pillage and war. Such a tribe, dangerous or harmless, or merely troublesome, according to the character of its chiefs, was roaming, towards the middle of the 13th century, in the north-western corner of Asia Minor, by the banks of the Sangarius and among the oak forests of the Bithynian Olympus; one, and an inconsiderable one, among the many tribes of the same race, who had fixed their tents, and some of them their thrones, in that fair but wasted land. This encampment of shepherds and freebooters was the germ of the Ottoman Empire.

It was but the fragment of a small Turkoman horde, which towards the beginning of the century,—among the many migrations and changes caused among the wandering races of Asia by the devastations of Genghis Khan,—had left its seats in Khorasan, which lay in the track of the Mongol invasions, to seek safer and remoter pasture grounds by the sources of the Euphrates. They seem to have wandered down the course of the river, to the neighbourhood of Aleppo, till, on the death of Genghis Khan, they again turned their faces eastward, towards their old abodes; but as the tribe was crossing the Euphrates, the horse of their leader, Suleiman Schah, stumbled from the steep bank, and his rider was drowned in the stream, at a spot which still keeps the name of the 'Turk's Grave.' This broke up the camp. Suleiman left four sons. Two of them continued their course eastward, and with the majority of the tribe, their posterity have been lost among the nomad hordes into which

[1] In our references to Von Hammer, we cite, unless the contrary is expressed, from the second *German* edition. (Pesth, 1834.)

Digitized by Google

they melted. The other two, Ertoghrul and his brother Dundar, with but 400 families, turned once more to the west, to become the founders of the mighty and terrible house of Othman.

At that time, the nominal masters of Asia Minor were the Turkoman Sultans of the family of Seljouk, who ruled at Iconium. Their protection was sought by their humbler kinsmen under Ertoghrul. The story goes, that in the journeyings of Ertoghrul and his tribe, they came upon a battle-field, where a fight was going on between two unequally matched armies. Ertoghrul could not resist the temptation to join in the fray; and, as he was a lover of justice and equity, resolved, while yet at a distance, and not knowing who were the combatants, to assist the weaker side. He found, after his horsemen had decided the battle, that he had helped the Sultan of Iconium, the great Alaeddin, against an overpowering force of Mongols. But with his ready hand, and love of fair play, Ertoghrul's ambition and desire was only for the retirement and peace of an unmolested pastoral life. He asked for no reward from the Sultan, but to be allowed to feed his flocks in some safe and secluded district; and Alaeddin assigned him the Black Mountain near Angora. Such was the account which the servants of the house of Othman delivered to its chroniclers, as what they had heard from the elders of the tribe, respecting the first occasion of the close alliance between their chiefs and the Seljoukian Sultans. But the retired pasture grounds of the Black Mountain were in time exchanged for a more public scene of life, which tempted and favoured more aspiring desires, and more stirring adventure.

In the decline of the Eastern Empire, its Asiatic border had gradually shrunk back before the Persians, the Arabs, and the Seljouks, from the Euphrates, to the south-eastern horizon of Constantinople, the Bithynian hills. The river Sangarius, with its chain of forts, and the passes of Olympus behind it, which covered the frontier, and fenced in the green and wooded plain which was spread round the walls of Nicomedia and Nicæa, had more than once been forced by the invaders, and Bithynia with its royal cities lost and regained, in the vicissitudes of border war. Bithynia was now a province of the Byzantine empire, the last that remained to it on the other side of the Bosphorus; and the outlying fringe of plain that extends beyond its mountain border, from the *eastern* slopes of Olympus to the banks of the Sangarius and the Thymbres, was a debateable ground, occupied and fought over both by Greeks and Seljouks. Here Alaeddin settled Ertoghrul and his horde, as an advanced camp, to guard the outskirts of his dominions, and annoy those of his Christian neighbours. He could not

Digitized by Google

have chosen a more efficient garrison. In the wasted and depopulated plain, and the extensive river banks, and in the cool summits and uplands of the neighbouring hills, the flocks of the tribe found ample and congenial range for their winter and summer wanderings; and its rapid and active horsemen were not more ready to defend their new pasture grounds, than they were to challenge the risks and excitement of border frays and plunder. They were skilfully and resolutely led: and a great trial of strength and cunning with the Greek borderers and their hired Tartar allies, established Ertoghrul's name, and his claim to the confidence of Alaeddin. In the front of the battle rode a crowd of light-armed skirmishers, whose name, the *Akindji*, became in later times but too familiar to the Christians of Hungary and Germany, as the name of the irregular bands, who preceded the march of the Ottoman hosts, and whose furious onset was the signal of battle. Behind their cover came the main array, the 444 companions of Ertoghrul, (Turkish tradition, which delights in combinations of the number *four*, has preserved the exact number,) which helped Alaeddin when he was overpowered by the Mongols. For three days and three nights the battle lasted; it began in the defiles of Olympus, crossed the mountain, and descended into the plain of Brusa; but in the end Ertoghrul broke and trampled down his enemies, and chased them through the plain, to the edge of the sea. Alaeddin had waited anxiously for the news; and in memory of the victory, and of the fiery horsemen of the vanguard, he called the name of the district which he had given to Ertoghrul, *Sultan Œni*, the *Sultan's Fore-front*. *Sultan Œni*—which still keeps the name, as a Sandjak or fief of the Ottoman empire—was the first land which the founders of that empire could call their own—the first foothold, from which they advanced, step by step, to the conquest of half the Roman dominion. In the narrow canton of *Sultan Œni* are found the first local names of Ottoman history, made to the nation venerable by their association with the abodes, the fortunes, the graves of its patriarchs, heroes, martyrs. Here are found the scenes of their birth, their combats, their loves, their councils. Here is still seen the village where the Cilician wife of Othman, long wooed and hardly won, spent her maiden years, with her aged father, the venerable Scheikh Edebali. And here by the roadside, the ancient domed tomb among the cypresses on the hill, of the Turkoman leader, whose children have arrogated to themselves a place above all other earthly thrones, is visited by Mahometan pilgrims with pride and devotion, near the hamlet where he ruled.[1]

[1] The village of *Shughut*, or *Sogud*, near the Sangarius. Leake's *Asia Minor*, p. 15; Von Hammer, i. 64.

Digitized by Google

There was nothing in the achievements of Ertoghrul and his camp to portend the greatness which his children were to reach. A remarkable contrast to the rise of most Asiatic empires, which, like those of Genghis and Timour, often grew to their colossal and terrific power in the life of one generation, the Ottomans advanced steadily, but at first almost imperceptibly. The Ottoman legends relate the dream of Ertoghrul, who had sought hospitality in the house of a holy dervish; and after he had stood all night long, reading the Koran, fell asleep, and in the dreams of morning, the time when dreams are divine, received the promise, that as he had honoured the Eternal Word that night by his devout watching, his children should be had to honour throughout all generations. But all that had been granted to Ertoghrul, at the end of a life of nearly a century, was but a wasted and narrow border tract, with its ruined villages and lonely hills; and Othman, his greater and more restless son, though he turned the thoughts of his tribe towards wider conquests, and though from him a nation and its name, new in history, had its beginning, yet had barely, at the end of his threescore years and ten, made himself master of half a small and feebly defended province.

The accounts of Othman's life pass insensibly from legends to history.[1] They begin with the patriarchal simplicity and romantic adventures of a chieftain of the desert: they end with the first rude outlines of the founder of a dynasty, and the territorial prince. But even the legendary part of his history—the stories of his marriage, his friendships, and the marriage of his son—exhibit, as it were in rudiment and figure, some of the most characteristic features of what was afterwards the policy of his race. Othman wooed and won a foreign wife to be the mother of his children. Besides his Tartar brethren and comrades, the 'Alps,' whose names are joined with his in the story of his wars, he sought beyond the camp the friendship of two sorts of men. The counsellors whom he venerated, whose sanction he sought for in all his plans, whose abodes he visited with reverent humility, and for whom lands and houses were largely and solemnly set apart in all his conquests, were the Scheikhs and dervishes, the learned and holy men of Islam. For his most daring and zealous captain, he had won over from his race and his faith, a Christian apostate. And as he had himself married out of his own race, so the legends tell us, how he

[1] The names of *Othman, Bajazet, Amurath, Mahomet,* are so naturalized in our language, that incorrect, and needlessly incorrect as they are, it is hardly worth while, at least in a paper like the present, and speaking of certain well-known historical persons, to replace them with *Osman, Bayazid, Murad, Mohammed,* or *Mahmoud.* It is too late to change, in general use, the familiar *Ottomans* for the more accurate *Osmans* or *Osmanli*; just as it would be to introduce the native forms of the names of Lyons, Leghorn, Naples, Florence.

Digitized by Google

laid in wait for and carried off into captivity a Christian damsel, to be the wife of his young son. We see already a foreshadowing of the domestic and administrative usages of the Ottoman house —its mixture of foreign blood, its slave marriages, its array of viziers and generals, torn away or allured from the choicest youth of surrounding Christendom; and a fierce military spirit, and institutions adapted only for war, intimately allying themselves with a religious element, and owning their only control in its ministers.

Othman had long to wait, and much to endure, before he could win the wife whom he had chosen, Malchatoun, the daughter of Edebali, a holy man, who had wandered from his birth-place in Cilicia among many cities of Islam, and had at last chosen for the resting-place of his old age, a village in Bithynia. Othman's love was passionate and strong. He visited with assiduous and humble reverence the threshold of the venerable Scheikh. But difficulties and dangers met and sorely tried him. Edebali refused to give his only daughter. Othman had a rival in the Greek chief of Dorylæum, who assembled his friends, and laid wait for Othman's life. Othman, indeed, slew his treacherous enemy, and gained, in the affray, his trustiest friend, Michael 'of the pointed beard,' one of the companions of the Greek captain; who, after having been vanquished and disarmed by Othman, was so struck with admiration of his conqueror, that he devoted himself to his service, and at last forsook for his sake creed and country, and became the ever ready assailant of his own people; the first of that long line of Christian renegades, who have been in every age the fiercest and the most terrible servants of the Ottoman power. But Malchatoun had yet to be won; and it required a dream sent from heaven, to overcome the scruples or fears of Edebali. Othman, in spite of the old man's discouraging words, waited, resigned and patient, under his roof, still reverently listening to his wisdom, still hoping in his own perseverance and fortune. One night he had a dream, such as is accustomed to be related of the founders of Oriental empires. He saw the full moon rise from the bosom of Edebali, and descend into his own; and from thence he saw a stately tree arise, which grew taller and more spreading, till it overshadowed the world. Beneath it arose four of the great mountains of the earth, Caucasus and Atlas, Taurus and Hæmus. From its roots issued four mighty rivers, the Danube, the Tigris, the Euphrates, and the Nile. Beautiful gardens and stately palaces were spread under its branches, with minarets, from whence the call to prayer blended with songs of nightingales, and the prattle of many coloured parrots. At length a strong wind bent the branches, the leaves lengthened out into the form of pointed sabres, which

Digitized by Google

turned to the chief cities of the world, and at last to Constantinople. Constantinople, between two continents and two seas, seemed like a diamond set between two sapphires and two emeralds—the jewel of a royal ring. Othman was about to put it on his finger when he awoke. A century and a half were to elapse before the promise of the dream was fulfilled. But it won Othman his wife, the predestined mother of a line of mighty kings, the last and the longest of the royal races of Islam.

For his son also, Orchan, he sought a wife of fairer beauty and higher blood, than could be found in the black tents of his wandering brethren. The early legends tell of alliances as well as feuds between the camp of the Turkomans and the Greeks of the towns. Ertoghrul and Othman had formed an alliance with the captain of the castle of Belecoma—an alliance marked by a curious mixture of confidence and mistrust. When the Turkomans drove their flocks to the hills in summer, they left the more cumbrous portion of their possessions in charge of the captain of Belecoma; but the compact was that the Turkoman treasures were to be brought into the Greek town, by none but the women and children of the tribe. For many years the agreement was faithfully kept. The Turkomans missed nothing at the hands of the Greek captain; and Othman, when he came down to the plains in winter, brought presents of cheese and honey, of horse trappings and carpets of goats' hair—the labours of the summer months on Olympus,—for his Christian ally. But, at last, say the Turkish chroniclers, the Greek grew jealous of Othman's power, and leagued against him. Othman was invited to the marriage feast of the captain of Belecoma, where the Greeks were prepared to seize him. Michael 'of the pointed beard,' whom the Greeks had in vain endeavoured to gain over to the conspiracy, warned Othman of his danger. Then he resolved on swift and signal revenge. He said he would be present at the nuptials. But as summer was at hand, and he was going up into the hills, he requested the bridegroom, the captain of Belecoma, to take charge as usual of the treasures of the tribe for the summer months, and to admit the women who bore them into the town. The gates were opened without suspicion; but this time, under the long veils and mantles came forty stout warriors, Othman and thirty-nine companions. The captain with his retinue was absent, preparing for his wedding on the following day, with the beautiful daughter of the chief of a neighbouring Greek town. Othman seized Belecoma, and then went off to waylay its master and the bridal procession, as they passed through a gorge in the hills on their road homeward. The surprise was successful. The bridegroom was slain; and his Greek bride, the 'Lotus-flower' of

Digitized by Google

Brusa, was swept off by the Turkoman robbers to their lair, to become the spouse of their leader's son, Orkhan.

But as the power of Othman grew, notices precise and circumstantial, with dates and names, appear by the side of these tales of desert life and border adventure. The year is recorded, and the place, in which Othman was raised from the head of a wandering camp, into a recognised Emir, or vassal of the Seljouk empire; and again, the date, when, after the Seljouk empire had fallen to pieces, Othman could call himself an independent prince, and began his struggle for conquest and preeminence with the other Turkish chiefs, most of them more powerful than himself, who had shared among themselves the heritage of Alp-Arslan in Asia Minor.[1] In 1289 Othman had seized a Greek town at the edge of that plain of Dorylæum, where he had long kept guard for the Seljouk frontier. The sultan of the expiring dynasty of Iconium rewarded the exploit of the rising border chief with the dignity of an Emir or Prince; and the 'Black Castle' (*Karadja Hissar*) on the Thymbres, deserves remembrance in history, as the place where the ancestors of Mahomet the Conqueror, and Soliman the Magnificent, ceased to be private men, and exchanged their rude preeminence for an acknowledged place among the lords of their people. The flag, the kettledrum, and the horsetail, the insignia of his new rank, were solemnly delivered to Othman, by the messenger of his feudal superior, the Iconian Sultan. Othman received them amid the clanging salute of barbaric music, with his arms reverently crossed on his bosom. And long afterwards, in remembrance of the investiture of the Emir of Karadja Hissar, his proud successors stood in the same attitude, when the trumpets and cymbals of the host sounded forth at the hour of prayer, till Mahomet the Conqueror thought it time to abolish the memento of his forefather's dependence, and rise to greatness, with the observation, 'that forms of reverence which have lasted 200 years, have lasted too long.'

At Karadja Hissar, the seat of his new government, Othman established a weekly market, according to a custom still characteristic of the Turkomans,[2] with its overseers, and a tribunal,

[1] The *Ten States*, mostly named after their first chiefs, were, on the Ægean, *Karasi*, in Mysia, *Saruchan*, in the Valley of the Hermus, *Aidin*, at Smyrna on the Mæander, *Mentesche*, in Caria, *Tekkeh*, in Lycia: the Midland States, *Kermian* and *Hamid*, in Phrygia and Pisidia: on the North Coast, *Kastemuni*, at Sinope and in Paphlagonia: in the South-east, the most powerful of all, inheriting the Seljouk capital, Iconium, and holding the approaches from Persia and Syria, the *Karamans*: lastly, the *Ottomans*, in Bithynia.

[2] Burnes' Travels, ii. p. 225.; iii. p. 7. Probably a fairly correct idea may be formed of the life of Othman's tribe, balancing between a camp and a fixed village—of their religious temper, their forays, their relations with their neighbours, from Burnes' account of the Turkomans of Shurukhs, on the border between

Digitized by Google

which became famous through the neighbourhood for its justice and impartiality. He turned the church into a mosque; and to the mosque he appointed the ministers of public prayer and preaching, and the judicial expounder of the religious and civil law. But he did not do this before he had first consulted the Elders of his camp and the holy Sheikh Edebali, by whose words he was guided, and till, by their advice, he had sought and obtained the sanction of his liege lord. But the Seljouk power was fast hastening to its ruin. For ten years only after the Sultan of Iconium had invested Othman with the rank of a vassal Emir, was the name of the last Alaeddin named, as his sovereign and liege lord, in the public prayer of Othman's town.[1] In the last year but one of the thirteenth century, Alaeddin's name was changed in the prayer which was said in the Mosque of Karadja Hissar, for that of Othman. And from this era, the opening of the fourteenth century, so famous in the religion and the poetry of the West, no other name but that of their own princes has been heard in the Friday worship within the Ottoman dominions. The Mahometan historians remark that the opening of each of the centuries of their era, which at that epoch nearly corresponded with the division of those of our own,[2] had been marked, up to the time of Othman, by the appearance of some renowned and mighty prince. The Prophet himself—the founder of the Ommiades—the great Caliph Al-Mamun—the first of the Fatimites in Egypt—the last of the great Abbasides—and lastly, the devastator of the world, Genghis Khan, 'stand like colossal figures, in the portal, each of his century.' At the threshold of the eighth, stands a name, after the Prophet, the mightiest of all, that of the founder of the Ottomans.

Yet a traveller could easily traverse in a day the dominions over which Othman first exercised independent sway. He was now, however, a sovereign prince, and he distributed the towns and hamlets of his principality among his companions and coun-

the Turkoman Khan of Orgunje, the strongest of these robber-chiefs, and the polished, but unwarlike empire of Persia. The tribe claimed kindred with the Osmanli of Constantinople. Around an old fort, were grouped the permanent huts of the Jews and traders, and the movable houses of the Turkomans. Their customs in courtship and marriage, in which the lover carries off his bride on horseback, accord with what the legend relates of Othman, but would startle his descendants. Burnes, vol. iii. ch. xii.—xv.

[1] A Mahometan ruler is known as an independent sovereign by two tokens:—1, when he coins money in his own name; 2, when the solemn Friday prayer is said in his name.

[2] It need perhaps hardly be observed, that the Mahometan years consist of *lunar* months; so that the years of *their* centuries gain on the years of *ours*. The beginning of the 8th century from the Hegira thus nearly coincided with the beginning of the 14th century of our era. The remark is more characteristic than accurate.

Digitized by Google

sellors.. And he himself, from the summits of Olympus, cast his eyes westward to the rich plains and fenced cities of Bithynia. The storm was not long in coming. A solemn council was held to deliberate whether Othman and his companions should try to add to their conquests. Dundar, his uncle, a patriarch of ninety years, who had come with Ertoghrul from the banks of the Euphrates, counselled peace. Othman's answer was an arrow in the heart of his father's brother; and thus, his resolution, sealed with the blood of a kinsman, was taken and confirmed to go forth and conquer.

The invaders found little to resist them, except the stone walls of the great cities. There was a time when the Greek Emperors had found no difficulty in beating back the inroads of freebooters, of the same race and hardihood as Othman's horsemen, who since the days of Alp Arslan had harassed the Bithynian frontier. Besides the regular armies, who waged war with varying success, the passes of Olympus and the villages of Bithynia had been given in charge to a stout and warlike race of borderers, who enjoyed great privileges, were proprietors of the land which they guarded, and were exempt from the oppressive taxes of the empire, on condition of being responsible for the safety of its limits. These free mountaineers 'formed a bold and active militia, which 'garrisoned a line of forts that commanded all the roads, 'bridges, and mountain passes;' and for a long time the bowmen of Nicæa were the most renowned soldiers of the Greek armies.[1] But about the time that Othman was born, the last and worst of the Greek dynasties mounted the throne. Michael, the usurper of an empire, which the Latins and the barbarians had left shattered and prostrate, yet stronger than any of its neighbours, had neither the virtue nor the genius to restore it; and a Greek courtier of the time declares, 'that he system-'atically weakened the Greek population from his fear of 'rebellion.' Among his measures was the destruction of the spirited and wealthy race who had so long and so effectually garrisoned the Bithynian frontier. By war and by confiscation, 'the resources of this flourishing province,' says Mr. Finlay, 'were ruined, and its population was so diminished, that when 'the Ottoman Turks attacked the Empire, the renowned 'archers of Bithynia, and the mountain militia had ceased to 'exist.'[2] Some of these, like Michael 'of the pointed beard,' the captain of one of the strongholds on Olympus, had carried

[1] Finlay, ii. pp. 411, 418.
[2] See Gibbon, viii. 56; Finlay, ii. 445; Von Hammer, i. 79.

Digitized by Google

their valour and their local knowledge over to the camp of the invaders. The Turks of Othman, like the bands of their countrymen on every coast of the Empire, rode and ravaged at will. Near Nicomedia, the mercenaries, who formed the Emperor's body-guard, met Othman in the open field; but they left the victory and the ripening harvest to the spoilers. Othman now knew his strength; and the plains of Bithynia had no longer any rest from the hoofs of his cavalry, nor its towns and fortified posts any security from the daring of his warriors. They were masters of the open country between Olympus and the sea; they rode unchallenged by the banks of the Bosphorus and on the shores of the Euxine; and they riveted their hold on a land which they were too few to occupy, by getting into their hands, one by one, a network of strongholds or considerable villages, which were distributed by a kind of feudal tenure among the companions of Othman. But there still remained the large cities, whose massive walls and guarded gates, the Turkish horsemen had not skill to approach, nor artillery to batter; and probably their numbers were too small to risk the losses of a storm.[1] But if Othman had no engineers or battering rams, he had that resolute patience which has so often marked his race. He had waited patiently when he wooed his wife; he had time before him, and could wait patiently for conquest. In front of Nicæa he occupied two small forts, from whence he resolved to keep guard on the harassed city, till weariness or chance gave the besiegers their prey. At Brusa he did the same. The posts in the neighbourhood were successively mastered by force or treachery; the Turks closed in on all sides till they had entrenched themselves within view of the outlets of the city; and for ten years they watched patiently, and apparently without giving or receiving disturbance, at the very gates of Brusa. At last the constraint became intolerable; when all hopes of relief were vain, the inhabitants, through the mediation of the renegade Michael, bought off their lives and a safe departure, at the price of their city, and the sum of 30,000 ducats; a sum which became in after times,—it is said from the precedent of the ransom of this

[1] "These Toorkmuns had made their descent near Meshid four days previously, about ten in the morning, and rode up to the very walls of the city, driving men and animals before them. Not a soul appeared to resist their progress. . . While we admire the courage of these men, what shall we think of the Persians, who are encamped within two days journey of Meshid, under the heir-apparent of the throne, and numbering an army of 20,000 men? . . . One wonders that human beings would consent to live in such a spot. The circle of villages round Meshid gets more circumscribed yearly, and in the one which we first entered, every field had its tower, built by the cultivator, as a defence to which he might fly on seeing the approach of a Toorkmun.'—Burnes, iii. 54—64.

But the Turks of Othman ravaged with a purpose.

Digitized by Google

first captured city, — the regular amount of the annual tribute, exacted from neighbouring Christian states as the price of peace, by the Ottoman Sultans. The Greek captain of Brusa, like Michael 'of the pointed beard,' threw in his lot with the conquerors and adopted their faith, and under the name of Evrenos, became in after times one of the most renowned of the chiefs who led the Ottoman hosts into Europe.

Thus a capital was won for Othman, more worthy of the founder of a dynasty, than the petty villages in which he had hitherto held his residence; and the beautiful city at the foot of Olympus became from henceforth, to the house of Othman, their chosen abode in life and resting-place in death, till in time it was exchanged for a still more magnificent and imperial site for their palaces and their tombs. It was won before Othman's death, but his eyes were not to see it. Othman was on his death bed, when the news was brought that what he had so long waited for was attained, and that Brusa had yielded itself to his son Orchan. It was his consolation in the gloom of closing life, when old ties were broken, and his course was ending. Four months before, the father of his wife, the friend and counsellor of his own manhood, the holy Scheikh Edebali, had been buried after a life of 120 years; a month after, his daughter, the chosen wife of Othman, had been buried by his side; and Othman was now following them. In the hamlet where he lay, his chief companions, the first men who had helped him in counsel and deed, men of the sword and men of prayer, were gathered round his bed—they were six, and Orchan the seventh. He charged them to carry his bones to Brusa; he would take possession of it at least in death. There his tomb, beneath the 'silver vault' of the old Cathedral of the castle, was shown till the beginning of this century, when a fire devastated Brusa; but the resting-place of his body is also claimed by one of those humble Bithynian villages[1] which profess to preserve so many of the monuments of the Ottoman fathers. 'Rule mercifully and justly, and uphold the law of Islam,' were his last words to his successor Orchan. So died 'Black Osman, the Longhanded.' He had lived simply, like the early warriors of his religion. He left neither silver nor gold; a salt-cellar, a spoon, an embroidered robe, and a new turban, were all the household treasures of him, whose descendants were the most gorgeous of barbarian kings: but he left some choice steeds; and the beautiful flocks of the Sultan which still pasture in the meadows of Brusa, are of the pure breed of those of Othman. The banner by which he was invested with

[1] Leake, p. 15.

Digitized by Google

his first dignity, and his scymitar, with waving blade and double point, are said to be still treasured as sacred relics in the armoury at Constantinople.

Orchan was comforted, as Othman had been, for the loss of a father, by the possession of a new conquest, and the birth of an eldest son. The same system of indefatigable attacks, waged with a steady and patient purpose, against the Greeks, was carried on by him, and the companions of his father's wars. Masters of the plain between Brusa and Nicæa, they had begun to encroach on the last remaining district of Bithynia, the country which forms one bank of the Bosphorus and faces Constantinople. Walls which they could neither batter nor scale did not discourage them. They prowled about the enclosures of Semendra, till one day a gate was opened to carry forth the governor's son to burial; the Ottoman riders swooped on the funeral procession, and the mourners and their town became their prey. The ramparts of Aidos withstood the power of Konuralp and Abdurrahman; but the heart of the governor's daughter was not proof against the manly beauty of Abdurrahman, whom she had seen from the walls; wrapping a letter to him about a stone, she threw it among the beleaguering armies, and concerted a plan by which in the night they gained admittance into the town. Such are the stories told of the gradual advance of the Ottomans. They are stories, not of fiery valour, but of wily and persevering watchfulness for opportunities. The great city of Nicomedia was taken, or perhaps retaken; and a new Ottoman province, called after the white-bearded warrior who had subdued it, Kodscha-Ili, the 'Old Man's Land,' was formed out of the further peninsula of Bithynia, and added to Orchan's paternal inheritance of Sultan-Œni.

The supineness of the Greek Emperor now became alarmed. Perhaps he had looked on the exploits of the Ottomans, as the Scottish king at Stirling or Edinburgh might look on the forays of the Moss-troopers, or on a Highland raid. He resolved, at length, to show himself in person to the troublesome and insolent freebooters. When for once they had departed from their custom of slaughtering the conquered garrisons, and offered him the governor of Aidos if he would ransom his officer, he had returned the answer worthy of bolder times, but only in place then, 'The Cæsar neither sells men, nor buys them.' He passed the Bosphorus with an army. The last and stoutest bulwark of the Empire in Asia, Nicæa, whose defence had rivalled in obstinacy the doggedness of its blockaders, now stood in pressing need of relief. The Greek imperial soldiers had beaten back the Seljouk Turks in many a field, and Orchan and his horsemen, formidable to the degenerate militia of the

Digitized by Google

Bithynian towns, were not yet prepared to encounter him. But, according to the accounts of the Greek eye-witnesses, the Emperor seems to have had no other idea, than a short and pompous military parade on the coast of the Propontis, without object or plan. When he had consumed two days in marching a few miles along the shore, while Orchan cautiously observed him from the heights, his counsellors proposed to him to offer battle, and if the Ottoman would not come down and accept it, to return as a conqueror to Constantinople. This was done next day. The confused and obviously mendacious account of Cantacuzene claims, in the first instance, a complete and sanguinary victory over a detachment of Turks, only 300, sent down to skirmish in the plain. But, after giving in full the speeches made by himself and by the Emperor, to animate the assailants, or to praise the victors, the same writer relates, that when the Greeks had victoriously driven their enemies to the hills, the Ottomans broke down upon the Greek host, 'disordered,' says Cantacuzene, 'with the excitement of a fresh attack, which the chiefs were unable to restrain;' and the result of the encounter was a hurried and disastrous retreat of the Emperor and his army. In the affray, he was himself wounded, and exposed to danger. Till the transports, which the Emperor urgently sent for, should arrive, the soldiery were dismissed, in separate detachments, to find refuge in the nearest forts. At Philocrene, while the throng of fugitives was pressing for admission, the key of the gate was mislaid, and the Ottoman horsemen were at once upon the rear of the crowd hewing down the hindmost. The next day, the fight, or the retreat, was renewed, and the great Hetæriarch, the Captain of the Greek body-guard, was slain. The Greek camp was taken, and with it the Emperor's tent and 200 of his horses with purple saddles. The imbecile vanity of the Byzantines has led them to give importance to this single and miserable attempt to arrest the Ottomans in Bithynia. But the inconsiderable numbers, given by Cantacuzene, both of the fighters and of the victims on both sides, show its real insignificance; and the Turkish historians, though it was the first encounter of their countrymen with the Greek Emperor in person, and a successful one, do not think the fight of Pelekanon worthy so much as of mention.

But it gave Nicæa into their hands. Wearied out with a long and unaided resistance, and thinned by famine and a plague, the inhabitants capitulated. They bargained for a free retreat with their property; but few of them took advantage of the condition. The majority chose rather to remain under the yoke of the unbeliever, than to cross over to Europe and

Digitized by Google

experience once more the justice and care of the Christian dynasty, which had first ruined them, and then left them a prey to the barbarians. Orchan did not molest them. He withheld his soldiers from the spoil of the city: but the widows and orphan daughters of those who had died from the sword or sickness during the siege, he distributed as wives to his followers. The Tartar blood of the whole tribe, as well as that of the chief and his companions, was early and largely mixed with that of their more highly civilized subjects.

Orchan at once turned Nicæa into a Moslem city, as his father had done with the Black Castle, on the Thymbres. In Nicæa was still seen, and still used for Christian worship, the memorable church, in which the 318 bishops had met to settle the faith of Christendom for the ages to come. The Church of the Council was turned by Orchan into a mosque; for the mosaic images on its walls was substituted the symbol of Islam; and amid the rubbish which now marks its site, Orchan's name appears sculptured over the doorway, 'like a phantom light among ruins.' Here, attached to this mosque, was the first Ottoman college founded, with its first publicly endowed teacher, the learned David of Cæsarea. 'In the place,' says Von Hammer, 'where the two bishops, Eusebius of Nico-'media and his namesake of Cæsarea, had been compelled, on 'pain of deposition and exile, to renounce their heresy and sub-'scribe the Nicene formula, Christian children, destined to 'recruit the ranks of the Janissaries, were now forced to for-'swear their faith; and here did Mollah David of Cæsarea 'comment and split hairs on the incomprehensible subtleties of 'the renowned mystical work, "The Seal Ring of Philosophies."' Here also Orchan established the first *Imaret*, or kitchen for the poor, a kind of foundation which became a favourite one among his successors and their servants; a devout disciple of the old Scheikh Edebali was set over it; and here Orchan himself, with Moslem piety, served the poor in person, distributed to them their dole of pottage with his own hands, and with his own hands lit the lamps at evening.

But Nicæa retained its importance under the Ottomans only for a short time. The seat of government of the district of Kodscha-Ili was soon transferred from it to Nicomedia; and Nicomedia itself was shortly eclipsed by the fair city of Brusa, which became first the capital of a third canton, in addition to those of Sultan-Œni and Kodscha-Ili, and then of the rapidly increasing kingdom itself. A manufacture of pottery was all that sustained the fame of Nicæa; that too has disappeared; and now Nicæa has to be sought for, within the vast circuit of its own solid and uninjured walls, which seem the enclosure of

Digitized by Google

a wild and forsaken chase, where Moslem pilgrims search for the tombs of some of the heroes of their early history, or the visitor from the West, with still greater difficulty, endeavours to trace the faint memorials, or to call up to his mind the image, of the famous Christian city.[1]

Orchan was now undisputed lord of Bithynia. But though his immediate neighbourhood to Constantinople made his position a troublesome one to the Greek Emperor, he was still in appearance the least considerable, and the least to be feared, of the Turkish potentates of Asia Minor. The Emirs of the coast, from the Troad to the passes of Issus, were more powerful, and, seemingly, more enterprising. Their friendship was disputed, and their hostility deprecated or used against one another, by the military traders from the rival Italian Republics, who fought for a footing on the Ægean coasts, as French and English fought in later days in India; but even at the end of his long reign, the Venetians had not yet learnt to know, or did not yet deign to acknowledge, the name or authority of the Turkoman chief of Brusa.[2] It is remarkable, that after the conquest of Nicæa and Nicomedia, and the final subjugation of Bithynia, a pause, almost uninterrupted, and apparently deliberately self-imposed, of nearly a quarter of a century, took place in the Ottoman conquests. The single interruption, (which occurred at the beginning of this period,) was the seizure by Orchan of the neighbouring Turkish principality of Karasi, the ancient Mysia. It had been a more powerful state than his own. Two rival brothers called him in, to settle their quarrels: but where the Ottomans once gained admittance, they remained; and Karasi was the first to give way before their fortune, of those nine Turkish states which, together with them, had started to independence from the ruins of the house of Seljouk, to be one by one crushed, and again re-united, under the mightier empire of the house of Othman. But after the conquest of Mysia, a deep silence reigns over the annals of Ottoman conquest for twenty years. Orchan sat still at Brusa, and scarcely appears on the scene, except as, at length, reconciled to the Greek Emperor, then, as his ally,—his son-in-law,—and his haughty and questionable protector. The Greek Empire was falling to pieces before his eyes, torn by the quarrels of kindred and rival emperors, and the ravages of the eastern and western barbarians, whom they called in to take part in their civil wars. It was wasted and ruined by Servians and Bulgarians from the Danube; by the insolent and encroaching merchants of Genoa, Pisa, and Venice; by the merciless and irresistible footmen of the Catalan Grand

[1] Leake, 'Asia Minor,' pp. 10, 11.

[2] Von Hammer, i. 130. (1353.)

Digitized by Google

Company; spring after spring, its shores saw the returning Turkish galleys, and its plains the returning Turkish horsemen. But though among them, at times, went Orchan's Ottomans, they were mixed and confounded with the greater crowds from the maritime states. Orchan looked on at the scene of decay and ruin, so near him and so inviting to his ambition; he was admitted to see with his own eyes the riches and the weakness, the confusion and the cowardice, of the Byzantine Court; he beheld his restless and adventurous rivals, the Emirs of Aidin and Saroukhan eagerly pushing for the destined prey. Yet for twenty years he held his hand, and his border remained the same. No fresh cities were taken or watched over. The old generation of Ottoman heroes, the conquerors of Brusa and Nicæa, passed away, and no new names are recorded in their place. When the Ottomans from time to time passed into Europe, with their brethren from the coast, it was merely for a summer's foray. The chief who had guided their early conquests was no longer riding at their head, and even professed to be the friend, as he had married with great pomp the daughter, of the Christian emperor. Orchan seemed to have become the most peaceful, or else the most inactive, of all the Turkish Emirs; and among the various Turkish assailants of the Greek Empire, no one at the time would have singled out him and his house, as its most terrible foe, and its destined destroyer;—no one, at least, who had not observed and understood the policy of their sagacious and persevering valour. The difference between them and the other Turks, who, contemporaneously with them, and at the moment even more fiercely than they, were breaking in upon eastern Europe, was the presence in the Ottoman house of a settled purpose. All the steps they made, though not hurried, were connected; and they never made one from which they drew back. The enterprises of the other chiefs, more alarming at the moment, were but the random and isolated adventures of robbers lusting after destruction and booty; important only as they prepared the way, by weakening the Greek Empire, for the loftier plans of their brethren.

For twenty years Orchan abstained from conquest, but he was not idle. While the Christian Empire beyond the Straits was perishing, he was busy, building up a power which was to be ready to take its place, and fit to grasp its heritage. The pastoral horde was becoming a state; the leader of the vagrant camp was taking delight in adorning the temporary capital of his house with the mosques and colleges, the hospitals and caravansaries, the fountains and tombs, which the piety and magnificence of Moslem princes are wont to rear in their royal cities. Brusa was well worth his care. From the last slopes

Digitized by Google

of Olympus it looks over a green plain of woods and meadows; the famous and beautiful mountain, with its forests and its cliffs, overhangs it behind; and its abundant and ever-flowing waters,—the warm medicinal springs which well out beneath the baths of the city, and the cold sparkling sources streaming down from above, among its rocks and plane-trees,—have made Brusa famous among Eastern cities. Not less famous is it for the choice excellence of its trees and fruits, its grapes and apricots, its chestnuts, each of forty drachms weight, and its forty kinds of pears. The sheep in its pastures produced the finest wool, its mulberry-trees the finest silk; and drew to it craftsmen, who made the work of their looms, their scarfs and embroidered stuffs, their lawn and their samit, renowned almost to our own day. Before the Ottomans appeared, Christian monasteries had gleamed among the woods of Olympus, or nestled in its folds; the hermit's cell had been hung on its precipices, or perched upon its crests, or hid within its caverns. Their place was taken by the Dervishes and the Santons, on whom Orchan bestowed his largesses with liberal hand;[1] and Olympus became a holy mountain, sanctified by their retreats while living, and by their sepulchres in death. Among them, also, were the earlier poets and theologians of the Ottomans, who loved the stillness and the shade of the murmuring pines. There they could lie, and look down on the glittering city and sunny plain below. The city of Orchan's choice had all that could make it dear to Moslems and orientals; it was a worthy home for the last conquerors of Islam to depart from, and return to, in their wars, and to rest in, during the days of

[1] Solitaries and devotees, some of them idiots, others fierce fanatics, others mystics, others extravagant ascetics, played a considerable part in early Ottoman history and its legends. *Abd-al-Kumral* prophesied the greatness, and led the soldiers of Othman. *Doghli-Baba*, the '*Father of pots*,' who took his name from the pots in which he kept the sour milk on which he lived;—*Geikli-Baba*, the '*Father of stags*,' who, at Orchan's invitation, came riding on a goat from the woods, with a scymitar of prodigious weight, to head the besiegers of Brusa, and bearing on his shoulder a sacred plane-tree, which long flourished in the sultan's palace there;—*Abd-al-Murad*, who wrought prodigies of valour with a wooden sabre of enormous length;—*Abd-al-Musa*, who took up burning coals wrapped in cotton; were among the saintly friends of Orchan, for whom he built cells on Olympus. His son Amurath built a cell for a venerated dervish, *Postinpusch*, a religious idiot, who clothed himself in skins. In equally high reverence was held the bleating dervish of Amasia, *Kojun-Baba*, the '*Father of sheep*,' who never spoke, but at the five hours of prayer bleated like a sheep, and at whose tomb Bajazet II. built 'the fairest and richest convent of the Ottoman empire.' These were all *abdals*, or solitaries. The numbers and orders of *dervishes* multiplied with rapidity under the Ottoman rule, in spite of the discouragement given in the Koran to the monastic life; and at first, exercised even more influence than in later times was possessed by the great spiritual associations of the *Ulema*, the men learned in the law of the Koran.—Von Hammer, i. 111, 151, 192, 137—141. See a curious woodcut of a '*Father of Stags*,' in *Nicolai's* Travels, (Antw. 1577,) p. 207.

Digitized by Google

peace. Here the first six Sultans kept their court, and here they lie buried in stately tombs, near the mosques which they founded. Round them are the sepulchres of their children and brothers; and these are encompassed on all sides by the resting-places and memorials of the great men of the rising state, its first viziers and lieutenants; and further, 'about the mausoleums of 'the early Sultans and Saints of the empire, are grouped some 'five hundred tombs of famous men,—pashas, scheikhs, pro-'fessors, orators, physicians, poets, musicians.' Thus gifted and adorned by nature, and consecrated by so many recollections and such venerable monuments, Brusa rivals Adrianople in dignity, and Bagdad in holiness, and still, when the Sultan's style and title is proclaimed, it is named as the third city of his empire.[1]

But while the buildings of a new capital of Islam were rising under Orchan's hand, institutions were growing up, during this interval of peace, of far greater significance and importance than the domes and walls of mosques and palaces. It was during Orchan's reign that the rudiments of what was lasting and characteristic, in the internal policy and organization of the Ottomans, were laid down by men who saw far and reached high. Orchan's brother, Alaeddin, had refused at their father's death to receive from Orchan's hand the moiety of their father's flocks and herds, which was his inheritance. 'As you will not 'take your portion of sheep and cattle,' said Orchan, 'you shall 'come and help me to feed my people.' Alaeddin then became his brother's chief minister, and is called the first Vizier, *i. e.* 'Bearer of Burdens', of the Ottoman house. To him is ascribed the beginning of the first peculiar orders and regulations which were added, in the Ottoman Statute-book, to the fundamental legislation of all Mahometan states,—the Koran, the traditionary Sunna, and the decisions of the Four Imams. The three principal objects of his attention, we are told, were, the coinage,—which was now for the first time struck in the name of Orchan, instead of that of the Iconian Sultans,—the distinctive costume, especially the head-dress, of the people,—and the organization of the army. Alaeddin's purpose, in regulating the dress, was, that while the Turkoman freebooters were growing up, under the influence of successful conquest, into the feelings of a distinct and ambitious nation, their pride in the name of Osmanlis might be kept up by a visible badge, which should mark them off, in their own eyes and that of others, from the mingled races round them. In contrast to the embroidered caps of the Greeks, and the red felt skull-cap with a turban of bright colours worn by the other Turks, the Ottoman warrior was

[1] See the Style, in Ubicini, *Lettres sur la Turquie*, p. 531.

Digitized by Google

commanded to wear a plain cap of white felt, of an egg-shaped form, round which only on days of ceremony a white linen cloth was folded.

But the work which has made Alaeddin's name memorable in the annals of his race, was the laying the foundations, and establishing the model, which, in expanded proportions, continued without change for three centuries, of the Ottoman army. Alaeddin and Orchan were clearsighted enough to discern that their indefatigable, but untrained horsemen, though they had overrun Bithynia, and worried its cities into surrender, were not strong enough to win and hold for good the realms of the Eastern Cæsars. Even before the degenerate guards of the Greek Emperor at Pelekanon, as long as they kept their array unbroken, Orchan's Turkomans had held back, in vigilant but cautious suspense. And there had lately been seen, on either side of the Hellespont,—specimens of those victorious Spanish battalions, who were changing the face of war in Europe,—a body of disciplined and well-appointed infantry, for whose steady and combined valour no warriors of the East, Servian or Bulgarian, Turk or Greek, had ever been found a match, and who from their stronghold at Gallipoli had imposed terms on Constantinople, and filled the countries round with the terror of their prowess and their ferocity—the Grand Company of the Catalans. No foreign enemy had vanquished these terrible Spanish footmen; it had needed their own swords, turned against one another, to tear in pieces and disperse the Grand Company. Such soldiers—bound together by a like training and devotion to one another, and to the game of war, but by a stronger obedience and more enduring enthusiasm,—the Ottoman chiefs foresaw that they would need, for the enterprise which the other Turkish emirs probably meditated in common with them, but for which they alone patiently and carefully prepared. To the bands of wild riders, who fought as the Turkoman warriors of Bochara and Orgunje fight still, in the deserts of the Oxus, or when they harry the villages of Khorassan, Alaeddin added the rudiments, small indeed, but distinctly marked, of a regular and permanent army. A thousand footmen were enrolled, and retained for continual and united service, by privileges, by discipline, by a frame-work of ranks and divisions, and by an ample pay. This nucleus of the Ottoman infantry shortly gave place, under Orchan himself, to an institution of far more remarkable character. But the organization of the cavalry, and the names of its divisions, recalled, even in the great musters of Soleiman and Selim, the primitive appointments of Alaeddin. There were the *Akindji*, the forerunners of the army, an unpaid and uncontrolled gathering of skirmishers and plunderers; all who could

Digitized by Google

procure a horse to mount and a sabre to wield, when the call came to pillage and adventure—men who fought after the old desultory fashion of the freebooters of Othman's camp; who, as the Ottoman power grew, swelled into terrible and destructive swarms, and, led by their hereditary captain, one of the descendants of Michael the Greek renegade, used to waste the borders of Hungary and Germany, and even at last dared to penetrate past Vienna, to the sources of the Danube. Then, forming the main strength of the host itself, came the horsemen, who had received grants in the conquered districts on condition of military service; the *feudatory Spahi*, among whom, as the Ottoman conquests extended, the revenues of the lands were parcelled out, in holdings of various size and dignity, from the *Sandjak Bey*, whose banner, the single horse-tail, gathered round it and led the cavalry of a province, to the tenants of the *Timars* and the *Ziamets*, the smaller and larger fiefs, who with their squadron or their handful of retainers, or perhaps their single horse and scymitar, swelled the levies of the Pacha who ruled over what, perhaps, had been once a kingdom. And, lastly, as a guard to the person and standard of the Prince, Alaeddin appointed a body of *paid* cavalry, divided, according to the favourite Turkish number, into four squadrons; a division which, with its names of the *Silihdars* and the paid *Spahis*, and the 'Foreigners' and 'Stipendiaries' of the right and left wings, remained unchanged in the regular Ottoman cavalry, whose increased pay and privileges and numbers made them, in after times, formidable yet unequal rivals, in turbulence and audacity, to the redoubtable footguards of the empire,—the Janissaries.

This great military corporation, the most remarkable that the world has ever seen grow up within the laws and policy of a state, traced its origin, according to the chief Ottoman annalists, to the counsellors of Orchan. Alaeddin's first experiment of a body of foot-soldiers, raised probably from the Turks of Bithynia and the neighbouring countries, was a failure. Pay and privileges could not reconcile them to the yoke of discipline; and the materials were not to be looked for, among these untameable freebooters, of a soldiery which should be trained to rival the steady valour of the Catalans. But the grim and patient sagacity of Ottoman enthusiasm and Ottoman policy was not long at fault. Allied by marriage to the old Scheikh Edebali, Black Halil Tchendereli had been one of the trusted seven who stood round the deathbed of Othman, and gathered up his last words; and when Alaeddin and Orchan's son Soleiman were dead, Black Halil became Orchan's Grand Vizier, and left his high dignity to his children of the third generation, for nearly a hundred years, till his great grandson was cut off in the very year in which he had

Digitized by Google

seen his master take possession of the palace and cathedral of the Cæsars. Black Halil was now 'Judge of the Host;' and he showed to Orchan and his counsellors, that though grown-up Turkomans could not be brought under discipline, children could be schooled to anything. The children of the conquered, he said, like all that belongs to them, are given to the conquerors, by the Prophet's law; and that law, besides, declares, that every child, of whomsoever born, brings with him into the world the disposition to embrace Islam. A school of Christian children, cut off from home and country, and trained with rigid discipline to the faith of the Prophet and the practice of arms, will grow up into an obedient and yet zealous and devoted soldiery. They will not much remember, in the pride of soldiership and the excitement of conquest, their old faith and friends; but their Christian and subject kinsmen will often look with wistful and envious eyes, to the honours and privileges of the children who were ravished from them. *They* will not wish to go back to Christendom and bondage; but many Christians will be tempted to come and share their religion and fortunes. Islam will be served and strengthened by the best blood of Christendom, and the numbers of its martyrs swelled by those who must have otherwise perished in their ignorance.

Other barbarous tribes, weak in numbers, but ambitious in purpose, have, before the Ottomans, recruited themselves from their subjects or their slaves.[1] But none ever employed this resource with such ruthless and deliberate system. The tendency to this policy, is discernible under Othman, in his foreign marriages, and in the story of the Greek renegade, Michael; but its establishment in a systematic shape was the deep and far-seeing invention of Black Halil. His counsel led to the formation of the Janissaries from Christian captive boys, and, later on,[2] to the establishment of a *fixed* tribute of young children, from the Christian population, to feed their schools,—a tribute which in the flourishing times of the Ottomans was continually exacted, though, probably, with Turkish irregularity and caprice, chiefly from the frontier provinces, and which lasted till the seventeenth century.[3] But his suggestion also expressed what has been in every age one of the chief secrets of Ottoman success. The

[1] Of the Lombards, a tribe not unworthy to be compared with the Ottomans, Tacitus had said, 'Langobardos paucitas nobilitat. Plurimis ac valentissimis nationibus cincti, non per obsequium, sed prœliis et periclitando tuti sunt;' and Gibbon adds, that 'the smallness of their numbers was recruited by the adoption of their bravest slaves.' Chap. xlii. [2] Apparently under Amurath I.

[3] The last levy of children from the Danube, Bosnia, Albania, and Greece, is said to have been under Amurath IV. in 1638: Von Hammer, iii. 177; Cf. Finlay, ii. 597; and a fuller and interesting account in Ranke's 'Ottoman Empire,' (translated by Kelly: London, 1843;) from Busbequius the Austrian envoy, and the Venetian *Relazioni*, from 1553—1637.

Digitized by Google

Ottomans have conquered and ruled by conduct and enterprise, by blood and sinew, which were Christian once. 'From the seminaries of the Janissaries, and the Sultan's pages,' says Von Hammer, 'issued the greatest men of the Ottoman empire. As 'long as the yearly levy of Christian children continued, and 'the expeditions of the Ottomans yielded their yearly booty of 'slaves, their most famous statesmen and generals were, for the 'most part, born Greeks, Albanians, and Bosniacs, and seldom 'native Turks. Thus the strength of Turkish despotism repaired 'itself in the heart-blood of Christendom; and by means of this 'cunning engine of statescraft, Greece was compelled to tear 'herself to pieces by the hands of her own children.'[1] The remark was made before him by a Venetian diplomatist at the court of Selim II.—'It is in the highest degree remarkable,' he exclaims, 'that the wealth, the administration, the force,—in 'short, the whole body politic of the Ottoman empire, reposes 'upon, and is intrusted to men, born in the Christian faith, 'converted into slaves, and reared up as Mahometans.'[2]

A long time must have elapsed before Black Halil's plan could have borne its fruit, and Christian children have been moulded into Moslem warriors. There is an interval of half a century before we hear of the Janissaries appearing in the Ottoman wars. Their first recorded field was the fight of Iconium, (1386,)—the first foes against whom their valour was pointed, were the kindred and rival Turks of Karaman. But from this time, in every great battle, and in every political crisis, their name is prominent. They were essentially and in their idea a body of picked and trained slaves—the household and family of their master; and it is in strange contrast with the fierce doings of this terrible soldiery, that in their titles of military rank, their internal subdivisions, their characteristic usages, we find only the homely names and menial associations of domestic life. They were numbered according to their *odas* or 'chambers:' in each of their ninety-'nine chambers,'[3] they were officered by a 'head soup-maker,' a 'head cook,' a 'head water-carrier,' and a 'manciple,' or 'caterer;' and after that Mahomet the Conqueror had incorporated with the original sixty-six 'chambers' the thirty-three companies of the servants of his kennels, (*Segbans*,) the four high officers who came next in rank to the Aga, and to his lieutenant, the Kiaia, or 'minister of the slaves,' kept their servile names, which denoted that they were respectively charged with the care of the hounds, the mastiffs, the bloodhounds, and the cranes of the Sultan's

[1] Vol. i. p. 193. [2] Barbaro, (1573,) in Ranke, p. 8.

[3] This is exclusive of the 100 companies of the armed pioneers and footmen, *Piade* and *Yaya*, who were originally a feudatory corps of infantry, but were afterwards incorporated with the Janissaries.—Von Hammer, i. 98, 727.

Digitized by Google

hunting establishment. Their military badge was the wooden spoon, worn in their cap, with which they ate their soup. What the Caroccio was to the militia of the Italian cities, what their eagles were to the legions of Rome and France, the great iron soup-kettle of the mess was to the Janissaries; they gathered round it for deliberation, as well as to share together the daily allowance from their master's bounty; and a vizier's head was about to fall, or even a Sultan's, and uproar and bloodshed soon to fill the streets of Constantinople and the courts of the palace, when the slaves sat in grim and gloomy silence round the hallowed symbol of their union, and refused to touch their master's meat.

But these armed slaves were also the most remarkable and most lasting of military brotherhoods. The world has seen some singular instances of men bound to one another, for the sole purposes of war, by principles or obligations deeper and stronger than those, which hold together for a time the fleeting assemblage of a common army—the soldier citizens of Sparta, the Roman legions of the Empire, the monks of the Temple and the Hospital, the troopers of Cromwell's 'new model.' But all the conditions and all the feelings which concentrated and which inspired the valour of Spartan citizens and Roman legionaries, of the brethren of the military orders, and the troopers of Naseby and Dunbar, were combined in the institute of the Janissaries. The ties of home and family which had been burst for ever when the boy began his training, were never allowed to reunite, even in a strange land and a different faith, as long as the soldier could do his work. The hunger and thirst, the watchings and the labours, which annealed to their due temper the spirit and frame of the Spartan boy, were not greater than those which exercised the young postulant of the Janissaries, when he was sent to Anatolia or the schools of the capital, to learn his new language, to imbibe his new fanaticism, and to practise the arms which he was to handle till his death. The mind of the Spartan boy, when he grew to be a man, was not more thoroughly warped from all the influences and interests of civil and social life, to think of war as the only end for which it was worthy to live, and to long for it, as his holiday and refreshment after the austerities of peace, than that of the new recruit, who entered one of those dormitories filled with the fiercest of the Moslem soldiery, all of whom had been once, like himself, baptized in infancy into the faith of Christ. Nor did the training, at once so crushing and so inflaming, so narrow and so intense, relax there. In these 'convent-like barracks' all was silence and subjection. The younger humbly served and waited on the elder. Within the walls, and among the brotherhood itself,

Digitized by Google

the word of the superior was the only law, the instinct of the inferior submissive obedience; without the walls, the lowest knew no master, except their Sultan. They were men who recognised no old kindred: they were not allowed to seek a new one in marriage.[1] Such is the picture which Venetian residents and Austrian nuncios have preserved of this wonderful association, in its early days.[2] The only comparisons by which they could convey an adequate idea of their order, their rigid discipline, their simple and sparing fare, their coarse garb, their silence, their grave self-command, the stillness which reigned in their barracks and in their immovable lines, their blind and absolute obedience, were drawn from the austerities and self-abnegation of monastic life. They were soldiers, but soldiers whose demeanour and appearance was that of monks.

Nor was the comparison far wrong. The animating principle of that fiery valour, which, in the early Ottoman wars, boasted —and enemies confirmed the boast[3]—that the Janissaries had never fled in battle, was a religious one. The bond of their companionship was an affiliation to a religious order. The well-known formula of the consecration of their institute, when Orchan or Amurath led the *New Soldiers* to receive their name and their benediction from the Scheikh Hadji Bektash, need not be repeated here.[4] The Janissaries called themselves the children and family of this great saint of Islam. They wore to the last the badge of their spiritual relationship; the strip of coarse cloth, which hung down behind from their white felt caps, represented the sleeve of the Dervish's mantle, with which he covered the head of the first Janissary when he named and blessed him. Hadji Bektash was also the founder of an order of Dervishes; and between these two families,—the brethren of prayer and the brethren of the sword—the strictest fellowship was kept up. The Janissaries were incorporated with the order of the Bektash dervishes. The Scheikh of the Bektashes was, in virtue of his religious office, the chief of the 99th *Oda* of the Janissaries: in their barracks, eight of the Bektash dervishes prayed day and night for the welfare of the realm and a blessing on the scimitars of their brothers. When those famous soldiers were destroyed, the Bektash dervishes were proscribed with them,

[1] Ranke, p. 19. [2] Ranke, pp. 7, 8. [3] Ranke, p. 7.

[4] 'Standing in front of their ranks, he stretched the sleeve of his gown over the head of the foremost soldier, and his blessing was delivered in these words:—"Let them be called Janissaries, (*Yengi cheri*, or new soldiers;) may their countenances be ever bright! their hand victorious! their sword keen! May their spear always hang over the head of their enemies! and wheresoever they go, may they return with a *white face*."' Gibbon, chap. lxiv; who assigns the institution and the consecration to the time of Amurath, the son of Orchan. Von Hammer, who gives it to Orchan, quotes as his authorities two of his earliest Turkish annalists, Neschri and Aali.

Digitized by Google

and shared their fate; and even now, in the extreme corners of the empire, travellers meet with a survivor of the condemned order, asking, with trembling, whether the men who slew the Janissaries, and chased away their brothers, are still in power.[1]

Thus the religious enthusiasm which had carried the first Arabs through their career of conquest, was revived and concentrated in these household slaves. It consecrated and gave dignity to their servitude, and raised them to be the most privileged body among their fellows. The Sultan was their comrade as well as their master, and inscribed himself by his simple name, as the first common soldier,[2] on their muster rolls. If the idea of a religious soldiery was suggested to the Ottomans by the knights of the Christian orders,[3] it found in Islam a still more congenial home. Christian Europe, which welcomed to its bosom monastic devotion, refused a lasting place in its system to a monastic soldiery. The ambition and power of the Temple, like its brilliant but troubled glory, soon passed away, struck down by the jealousy of the western kings. The Knights of S. John had a longer and nobler history. Bravely, but in vain, on the bastions of Rhodes,—bravely, and *not* in vain, on the rocks of Valetta, they stood at bay, when the armadas of the Ottomans awed the Mediterranean,—when Turkish corsairs swept the shores of Italy and Provence, and the name of Barbarossa or Draghut fluttered the cardinals within the walls of Rome. But relegated to their distant outposts,—keeping garrison in their island-strongholds, or afloat on their galleys in the eastern seas,—the knights exercised no influence on Christendom, except by the tales which came home of their heroic valour. When the Turk had ceased to menace, their work was done, and they languidly expired. But the company of the Janissaries at once made and marred the fortunes of the state within whose precincts it grew up: they were the nerve of its conquering armies, and the masters of its princes; they grew from the most exclusive of soldieries, to a great social guild,[4] and ramified from the barracks of the capital to the bazaars and caravanserais of the remotest towns;[5] and when they were

[1] Macintosh's 'Tour in Turkey,' ii. 40.

[2] Ubicini, p. 443.

[3] Von Hammer, i. 140.

[4] The steps of their decline are traced by Ranke, pp. 19, 20.—'1. Under *Soleiman* I. (1520—66), the Janissaries *took themselves wives*. 2. Under *Selim* II. (1566—74), they had *their sons enrolled* among them. 3. Under *Amurath* III. (1574—95), they were forced to admit among them *native Turks*, of a totally different descent, *who had not undergone their training*. 4. Under *Ahmed* I. (1595—1617), the privates, then stationed in the country and on the frontier, began *to ply trades*, to engage in commerce, and, satisfied with the advantages of the name, to think little of arms.'

[5] 'The prosperity and trade of Trebizond are perpetually disturbed by the

Digitized by Google

rooted up to save the state, it is doubtful whether the core and life of the state were not rooted up with them.

Orchan could well afford to stay his hand from conquest for twenty years, when those years were the first years of growth to the company of the Janissaries,—the years in which its strange and formidable character was clearly determined and strongly impressed on it, and the spirit breathed into its silently forming elements, which was to be the gage of continual victory and wide dominion, and which centuries were not to extinguish. But though the Ottoman frontier was not advanced, Orchan was by no means an unconcerned spectator of the scene of ruin and dissolution which the Greek empire beyond the Straits presented. Since the Ottomans had defeated the Byzantine emperor at Pelekanon, the pedant courtier, his master's trusted favourite, who lost, and who has left us the story of that disgraceful day, had become by his intrigues the usurping partner, and then the open rival, of his master's infant son. Cantacuzene warred with a Palæologus for the Empire, as the Palæologi had been in the habit of fighting for it among themselves. They were not content to burn and destroy, by the hands of their own soldiers, what was left to the Empire of its towns and cultivated districts; they invited to their aid the Turkish hordes from Bithynia, the Turkish pirates from Smyrna and the coasts of Caria and the Troad; and in return for such uncertain and precarious assistance as they were willing to render, the competing Christian emperors gave them free licence to pillage and enslave throughout their provinces, and formally consented to the demand, that the robbers should have a market for their Christian slaves in the capital of eastern Christendom.[1] Cantacuzene is not ashamed to dwell with self-complacent conceit—for in such a man it can hardly be called pride—on the close intimacy which continued till death between himself and a Turkish chief of freebooters; and celebrates what he calls the good faith and constant honour of his Mahometan friend, who was a useful counterpoise to Cantacuzene's enemies, but whose barbarian swarms wasted Cantacuzene's land, and swept off his subjects as ruthlessly as other Turks. Cantacuzene found a romantic friend in the Emir of Smyrna;[2] but in the Emir of Brusa,

factious quarrels of two *odas* of Janissaries, in one of which 30,000 *Lazi* are commonly enrolled.' Gibbon, (from De Tott, [1784,] iii. 261,) chap. lxviii. 'The Turks of Macedonia who bear arms are Spahis, Yuruks, and Janissaries. The Spahis are the cavalry formed by the holders of the ziamets and timars, when called on by the government. The Yuruks cultivate their own lands, chiefly in the mountainous districts. The Janissaries are the garrisons of the fortified places, among whom are generally enrolled the greater part of the heads of families engaged in trade or manufactures, or who have landed property in the neighbouring plains.'—Leake, (in 1806,) Northern Greece, iii. 249.

[1] Finlay, 552, 553. 572; Gibbon, viii. p. 63.

[2] Ibid. p. 60.

Digitized by Google

as we learn from his own unblushing narrative, the heir of Augustus and Constantine was glad to find a son-in-law. Orchan demanded, as the price of allowing his horsemen to ride and ravage in the name of Cantacuzene, rather than of Palæologus, that Cantacuzene should give him his daughter Theodora.[1] Cantacuzene took counsel with his friend, the Emir of Smyrna, and followed his urgent advice to enlist, by any means, so important an auxiliary on his side. When in after years, a deposed emperor, and a monk in one of the convents of Athos, he looked back on his schemes and deeds of ambition, and wrote their story, he had the heart to perpetuate the minute and pompous ceremonial with which his royal daughter, the daughter of the Emperor of the East, was delivered over to her Turkoman and infidel husband. Pompous and minute as the ceremonial was, one thing was left out—there was wanting even the form of Christian marriage.[2] So low had the purple of the Cæsars fallen; so rapidly had the fortunes mounted, of the son of the shepherd 'freebooter of the Bithynian hills.' The bride of Orchan's youth was the Greek chief's wife, whom his father's riders had carried off in a border fray. Fifty years had passed; and now the bride of his old age was another Christian damsel, the noblest of her country, given to him publicly in the face of the imperial city, with all the magnificence and formality of the most ceremonious court in Christendom.[3] And yet this loathsome and infamous sacrifice was not enough to purchase even a respite. Two years after his marriage, Orchan paid a solemn visit to the Byzantine court, and nothing was spared to do him honour. But the visit was scarcely over, when picked bands of Ottomans were across the Hellespont, wasting the Thracian cities, sweeping off booty and slaves from the very gates of Constantinople, and encountering in battle the Emperor Cantacuzene himself. When the traders of Genoa, from their fortified factory of Galata, bearded and assailed the emperor in his own harbour and palace, Orchan without scruple listened to their request for assistance, and, though in a state of profound peace with Cantacuzene, lent his Ottomans, to help them to insult his ally and his kinsman. At last the hollow friendship, which was Cantacuzene's main support on the throne, ceased even to be professed;

[1] Finlay, 572. 'His throne was only supported by his close alliance with his son-in-law, Orkhan, *whose troops were allowed to use the Greek territories as a hunting-ground, to supply their slave-markets.*' [2] Gibbon, viii. p. 63.

[3] Von Hammer, i. 128. 'Between his first and his last marriage a half century had passed of conquest; and in the interval, the Grecian wife was changed from the ravished Castellan's bride into the emperor's daughter, freely bestowed, and, delivered to him with the pomp of a state ceremonial.'

Digitized by Google

Orchan negotiated alike with both the rival emperors, and seeing his own interest in keeping alive their quarrel, favoured each by turns, to weaken and destroy the other's power.

At length, at the very close of Orchan's life, the march of Ottoman conquest, which had been suspended for the work of consolidation, took up what had been left off at the fall of Nicomedia and the annexation of Mysia, and resumed its course. The Ottomans, like the other Turks, had long been too well known on European ground; but with the sea between them and their homes in Asia, they had not yet dared to settle there. At last they made the stride which separates ravage from conquest. Othman lived to see Brusa won; Orchan, the conqueror of Brusa for his dying father, reigned till the Hellespont was crossed and Gallipoli occupied by his son Soleiman. Each saw the first step made in the enterprise which filled the thoughts of his life; but the conquest of a province, which had been the ambition of the father, had swelled into that of an empire, in the plans and meditations of the son.

This great and decisive step, which, to the Greeks of the time, seemed but an ordinary incident in the harassing and insulting warfare to which they had become familiarized and resigned, is felt in its full importance by the Turkish historians; and if the details of their narrative are doubtful and untrustworthy, the Ottomans showed their sense of the event itself, by the legendary, if not fabulous, halo with which they invest it. It is the first occasion on which they think it worth while to record the passage of their countrymen into Europe. Soleiman, the son of Orchan, say the Turkish chroniclers, was spending the night—a fine moonlight night—among the ruins of what had been Cyzicus. His fancy was moved and his spirit awed by the sight of abandoned grandeur, of which the history was unknown to him: as he gazed on broken columns, and marble pavements over which the waves rippled, and triumphal arches reflected on the waters, he thought he saw one of the ancient cities which the genii had built for Solomon, with Persepolis and Tadmor; he believed himself among the palaces of Balkis, the Queen of the South, and the wonderful magnificence of the days of old, when the true believers were helped by the hand of Heaven. Again he looked, and the radiance of the moon upon the sea seemed to stretch away to the Thracian hills, and to be like a silver band joining his lands to the lands of the infidel—Asia to Europe. He remembered the dream of Othman, and how there the full moon was the presage and opening of his ancestor's vision of empire. Again the moon

Digitized by Google

was shining; and he seemed to hear in the murmur of the waves a call to follow where the radiant path across the waters pointed. Then, says the legend, his resolution was taken to bind the two continents together by the might of the Ottomans; and it was confirmed by the old warriors, whom his father had given him as counsellors in the government of his province. That same night two of them—Adschê-beg and Ghazi Fazil—rowed across the strait in a shallop, and brought back with them a Greek prisoner, who told them that the fort of Tzympe, a short distance from Gallipoli, was left without a garrison. Soleiman cut ox-hides into strips, and with them bound together trunks of trees into two rafts; thirty-nine of his bravest companions, and himself the fortieth—the legend keeps the favourite number, like the forty companions of Othman, and the forty robbers of the Arabian tale—trusted themselves on the rafts, and on the following night were ferried across the Hellespont. Among them were the great Ottoman heroes of the time, with the renegade Greek chief of Brusa, Evrenos, the future conqueror of Greece and Macedonia, who was to grow grey as the most renowned among the captains of Amurath and Bajazet. The defenders of Tzympe were abroad in the fields, gathering in their harvest beneath the moonlight: a dung heap had been left, raised against the rampart, and over it the Ottomans mounted. They were followed next day by a large body in barks, and before three days were over 3,000 Turks had crossed to Tzympe, and held it fast. This crossing of the Hellespont is fixed by the Ottoman historians in the year 1356.

Cantacuzene was at the very moment asking the help of Orchan against the rival Greek Emperor. Orchan sent Soleiman himself; he beat back the Servian and Bulgarian allies of Palæologus, and then swept the valley of the Hebrus on his own account. But within a few months, a fearful catastrophe of nature threw open still wider to the Ottomans the gates of the Greek empire. While Cantacuzene and Orchan were negotiating about the restitution of Tzympe, an earthquake laid in ruins the cities of the Chersonese, and shattered their ramparts. It was winter; torrents of rain were followed by snow and piercing frosts; and in the midst of desolation and death from the fury and bitterness of the elements, the Ottoman robbers, 'like evening wolves,' came rushing in through the riven walls, to plunder, and now to occupy, the ruined cities. In this way they seized Gallipoli, while their chiefs were treating about the ransom of Tzympe.

It would have been surprising, if anything but force could have wrung back from the wily Ottoman a prize of which he knew so well the value. But his answer to the remonstrances

Digitized by Google

of his father-in-law and ally Cantacuzene, is characteristic of the grave and ironical perfidy, which soon became one of the distinguishing marks of his family and race. Cantacuzene, he said, had no right to demand back Gallipoli, and the neighbouring towns of the Chersonese, 'for it was not the force of 'arms which had given them to the Ottomans, but the earth-'quake.' Cantacuzene, according to some historians, was unable to pay the ransom which the Turk demanded. But it is plain that no ransom would have paid the price of that secure lodgement in Europe, which the opportunity of the moment had given him, and which was obviously the next step, whenever it could be taken, in the manifest policy of Orchan's house.

The operations of modern war have but lately reminded us of the importance of Gallipoli as a military position, where the safety of Constantinople is at stake. Its importance in the times of Orchan might have been less, if the maritime superiority of the Greeks, which at this period seems clear over the light Turkish barks, had been turned to account by resolute and able leaders. But in the hands that ruled Byzantium, it was useless. Fifty years before, the Catalan Grand Company had seized on Gallipoli, and from this commanding stronghold, joined to the land only by a narrow isthmus, and open to the sea, had sallied forth at will, to ravage the Greek provinces, to help or to overthrow an Emperor, and to insult the Imperial City at its gates. The system and the success of the Catalans, in this as in other instances, were obviously not lost on the Ottomans, who possessed their valour and their internal discipline, with far more of settled and formidable purpose. At Gallipoli, they held a post impregnable to the Greeks, which at once secured the ferry between Europe and Asia, and gave them the mastery of the approaches to the harbour of Constantinople. The same system of waiting and watching at the gates, which had given Brusa, Nicæa, and Nicomedia into their hands, was now applied on a larger scale to the reduction of the capital of the Empire.

In Gallipoli, Soleiman settled a colony of Asiatics,—Turks and Arabs,—and divided the lands of the Chersonese among the warriors who had been, according to the Turkish legend, the companions of his nocturnal voyage across the Hellespont. Many of them left their names to the places where they resided, and the tombs of some of these heroes of Islam make Gallipoli a venerable spot. But it is still more sacred in the eyes of Ottomans, as possessing the tomb of Soleiman himself. He died, shortly after leading his people into Europe, not in the battle-field, nor from disease, but because his horse stumbled, while he was flying his hawks in a field near Bulair. He was buried where he fell, by a mosque which he had

Digitized by Google

built, within view of the sea. His grave marks the northern entrance of the Hellespont, as that of Protesilaus does the southern. 'For a hundred years,' says Von Hammer, 'he was 'the only Ottoman prince who lay buried in European earth; 'and his tomb continually invited the races of Asia to perform 'their pilgrimage to it with the sword of conquest. Of all the 'hero-tombs which have been hitherto mentioned in connexion 'with Ottoman history, there is none more renowned, or more 'visited, than that of the second Vizier of the empire, the 'fortunate Crosser of the Hellespont, who laid the foundation 'of the Ottoman power in Europe.' The atmosphere of legend still environed his memory in death. Ottoman story-tellers related to enthusiastic hearers, and Ottoman historians gravely repeat the tale, how when a mighty Christian armament landed near the holy tomb at Bulair, the hero Soleiman reappeared, leading a host of heavenly warriors, radiant with light and mounted on white horses, to the aid of his hard-pressed countrymen, and utterly destroyed the invaders. But the learned and impartial German, who has collected the Ottoman records, is at the pains to inform us, that the armament, the battle, and the victory, are irreconcilable with the more authentic facts of history.

Orchan survived his son Soleiman scarcely a year: he died in the year 1359. With Orchan and Soleiman, the lawgiver and the champion, seems to end the age of the heroes in the Ottoman annals: with the conquests of Amurath, these annals enter into the domain of European history.

Then it was known why Orchan had held back so long. When his son Amurath took up his father's work, it was seen at once, in terrible clearness, what a change had come over the Ottoman invaders. In that significant and eventful pause in their advance, the rude freebooters, who prowled in conscious and patient helplessness round the impregnable ramparts of Nice and Brusa, content if, after ten years of untired watching at their gates, they might surprise or weary out their prey, had become transformed into self-reliant and ready soldiers, able for all the works of victorious warfare, for swift, and continued, and enduring conquest. With Amurath begins, rapid and sudden, the irresistible outburst of Turkish power. Their roving bands, indeed, had long known well the routes in neighbouring Europe; they were familiar with the towns and cities of Thrace and Macedonia, under whose walls they had often swept in insulting security. They had watered their horses in the Strymon and the Axius, in the Morava and the Danube; but they had come and gone. But when, in the first year of Amurath, their squadrons issued from the fastness of the Chersonese, along the

Digitized by Google

narrow isthmus of Bulair, and through the towns which Soleiman had already occupied at its outlets and approaches, they entered to remain; they were come this time to divide and take possession. All the harassing forays of their predecessors are forgotten, compared with this great and determined advance, which in less than thirty years, for the second time in history, established an Asiatic power in Europe; and which made the Greek emperor a vassal to a Mahometan chieftain, for all that was left to him of his renowned empire,—the city and outskirts of Constantinople.

The intrigues of the rival Turks of Karaman detained Amurath for a moment in Asia; but the rebels of Galatia were soon put down, and the important castle and city of Angora, reputed by Ottoman writers one of the strongest in the line of Turkish fortresses from Buda to Van, was secured, to guard the eastern limits of the Ottomans. Then he at once crossed into Thrace, where his brother's grave seemed the call to conquest and its pledge. There was no delay in seizing the towns that remained untaken, in the vicinity and on the approaches of the Chersonese. From them he marched boldly into the heart of what had been the Greek empire. Amurath threw himself on the great military road which joins Constantinople to the Upper Danube, and so to the countries of the west: the towns upon its line were successively and swiftly occupied; while another body, under the veteran renegade Evrenos, and another of Orchan's old captains, pushed up the valley of the Hebrus. Didymotichon, the modern Demotica, the future prison of Charles XII., was taken; and Amurath, pleased with its position, and with the capture of a favourite residence of some of the Byzantine emperors, thought it worthy of being selected for the site of his first European palace. But a grander capital than Demotica was within his grasp. The Ottoman powers by the Hebrus, and the great north road, were converging on Adrianople. Hadji Ilbeki, the conqueror of Demotica, had ridden that year up to the walls of that great city, and boldly maintained the possibility of its capture. The thought of the greatness of the prize seems to have made even Amurath hesitate; but the council of war was held, and it was resolved to venture. The Greek governor of Adrianople risked and lost a battle outside the gates of the city, the first and last which the Greeks dared with Amurath. The Greeks fled, and Adrianople surrendered. In Amurath's first campaign in Europe, before he had been two years on the throne, the rival capital to Constantinople, lying opposite its very gates, and barring the approaches from western Christendom, came without resistance into his hands.

Digitized by Google

From this time, till Amurath's last field, no check stopped him in his steady progress. Along the great north-western road, the flame leapt from point to point, along its stations and towns, from Adrianople to Philippopolis, from Philippopolis over the passes of Hæmus to Sofia, from Sofia to Naissus, on the edge of the Servian kingdom, and within a few marches of Belgrade. Westward, along the old Egnatian way, Evrenos pushed onwards, and prepared the way to Greece: he halted only after he had crossed the Axius, at the Macedonian town of Vardar;[1] the castles and strongholds, which had not yielded to him on his first passage, were one by one mastered afterwards, and a line of posts in the mountain passes and on the coast secured; Serres, and the fruitful valley of the Upper Strymon, on one side, and the great city of Thessalonica on the other, at last, after several years, completed the Turkish conquests over the southern shore of Thrace. Nor were the Turkish invaders come this time merely to conquer. At the furthest points of their progress, they at once began to build and to endow, as the permanent occupants of the soil, not only for themselves, but for their posterity. At Vardar, Evrenos was the founder of richly endowed caravanserais and public kitchens for the poor; at Philippopolis, Lalashahin left his memorial, in a noble bridge of stone two bow-shots in length, and wide enough for the passage of two carriages abreast; and gave a large number of slaves, for whose sustenance he provided, to keep it in repair. The towns on each side of the great Adrianople road were captured; and thus the circle of Turkish occupation round Constantinople was completed and drawn closer, and the Emperors were isolated, at least by land, from their ancient realm. In due time, Hadji Ilbeki pushed up the valley of the Tundscha, which comes down from the Balkan to join the Hebrus at Adrianople. The towns on the pleasant southern slopes of the mountains, Iamboli and Aidos, and Sizeboli on the sea, were taken. Then the great dividing range was crossed. The Ottomans threaded from the south the defiles, which led to the plains of Bulgaria and the banks of the Danube. Then first, names are heard of, which have been heard so often, and with so much interest, since; then first we hear of the mountain-nest of Schumla, which has so often sheltered the Ottoman armies; and at the end of Amurath's reign, we hear of the Ottomans round the towns of the Lower Danube, from Nicopolis and Rustschuk to Hirsova, and of the first siege, recorded by history, of Silistria.

It was not with Greeks that the Ottomans disputed for the

[1] *Yenidjé Vardar*, near the old *Pella*. See a sketch of it, in Lear's 'Albania,' p. 30.

Digitized by Google

Greek empire. *They* struck no blow—princes or people—for their land and homes: the invasion roused indignation and resistance, but not in them. Amurath found antagonists; but they were competitors for the inheritance of the empire and the prize of Eastern Europe, jealous that he should forestal them. His battles on Greek soil were fought with other foreigners, who wrangled with him for the helpless carcase of the Byzantine dominions. It was the Sclavonic nations from the Danube and the Drave, Servians, Wallachians, and Bulgarians, who met him in his first field, and his last, and who struggled for supremacy in the plains of Thrace, with the Turkomans from the Oxus and the Caspian.

In the weakness of the Greek empire, a rival Christian state had insensibly risen on its western border, as the Ottomans had grown up on the east. Stephen Dushan, a politician, a legislator, and a warrior, had laid the foundation of a powerful kingdom amid the wooded mountains of Servia: he had established his authority and his influence over the multitude of local hereditary nobles, by whom his race, like the rest of the Sclavonians, were ruled; he was received as a deliverer by the Bosnian chiefs, as a protector by the republic of Ragusa; his standard was followed by the warlike tribes from Albania; he was obeyed in Arta and Belgrade, in Macedonia and Bulgaria; and he assumed the name and the ensigns of a Roman Cæsar, the tiara, and the globe and cross. Stephen Dushan left behind him a great national name; but an unfinished work. He lighted up a high ambition in the aspiring race whom he had ruled; but he died too soon, and the nation itself was too immature, for the consolidation of the loose and refractory elements of Servian power. Servia had led the Sclavonians in challenging the advance of the Ottomans, but with no fortunate issue. From the first, the superiority of the Ottomans declared itself; and the votive Styrian chapel of Mariazell, the most sacred place of pilgrimage in Austria, preserved the memory of the escape of Louis of Hungary, when he fled on the banks of the Hebrus from the Turkish scymitar, in the first encounter of the confederate Sclavonians with the lieutenants of Amurath, though the Styrian legends of the sanctuary itself have changed the defeat into a victory. Thus early, though unsuccessfully, began the fierce, long struggle, between the Ottomans and the nations which found their rallying point in the house of Austria. But the part and position of the Greek emperor was a very different one. John Palæologus, after the first burst of Turkish conquest, begged for and obtained peace at Constantinople, while Amurath overran the rest of his dominions;—a peace which the Greek only on one occasion attempted to interrupt, when he went to Italy to offer the submission of the Eastern

Digitized by Google

Church as the price of a new crusade. In this he failed; an ignominious arrest at Venice for debt, which was paid by the sale or pawn of the church plate at Constantinople, detained him a while; and then he returned, to offer his services against the enemies of the Ottomans, and to spend the remainder of his reign as the humble and resigned dependent on the good pleasure of Amurath. His degraded and pitiable vassalage, as well as a terrible earnest of that merciless cruelty which ran in the blood of the Ottoman house, are shown in the story of the conspiracy against their fathers, of his son Andronicus with Saudschi, the eldest son of Amurath. Amurath, when he heard of it, summoned the Emperor to prove his own innocence at the Emir's court; and when John had, without difficulty, convinced his master that he could not have been a party to such perilous designs, Amurath called on him to join him in arms against their insurgent sons, and in a compact to blind them if they were captured. The rebels were overthrown; Amurath, say the chroniclers, approached their camp at night, and called aloud to their Ottoman soldiers to leave them. The soldiers heard once more the voice which had been wont to lead them in battle, and could not resist its fascination. The rebellious sons were taken. Amurath redeemed his pledge in full measure; he first put out his son's eyes—then, when he had discharged his promise, he slew him. Andronicus was also blinded; but it was done imperfectly, and Amurath reproached his dependent for his weak compassion for his son. He himself was guilty of no such mercy for the Greek associates of Andronicus. From the banks of the Hebrus, he looked on calmly and unmoved, while the captive nobles were thrown, tied in pairs, into the river, from the battlements of Demotica. His composure was only disturbed by a laugh of scorn, when a hare, the emblem to the Ottomans of the Greek race, crossed his view, pursued by dogs, and he saw in the circumstance a coincidence, which moved his mirth, with the bloody scene which his war hounds were enacting before him. Yet Amurath was proud enough to be magnanimous. Manuel, the emperor's second son, who had tried to raise the standard of resistance to the Turks in Macedonia, when he found every place of refuge, even his father's palace, closed against him by the terror of Amurath's name, boldly threw himself on the chance of his mercy, and appeared before him at Brusa. Amurath spared him. He pardoned his past misconduct—thus is their interview described—and warned him, that on his mended behaviour would depend the mending of his fortunes in Europe; and then he sent him to his father, and gave the Emperor leave to open the gates of his capital to his own son, on condition that he would guard him carefully. It

Digitized by Google

is the historians of the Greek empire who are our authority for these features of its decline.

Amurath inherited the organizing spirit of his father Orchan. The countries he occupied were caryed out into military tenures, the smaller *Timars*, and the larger *Siamets*, for the horsemen who had come across with him from Asia, and the bases laid of that great feudal system, which so long and so inexhaustibly fed the Ottoman armies, and riveted their power over the subject races, while it prevented the conquerors from identifying themselves with the soil, or feeling themselves more than, as it were, its lessees and tenants. The privileges and the service of this feudal militia, were defined and regulated; and in the place of the old Moslem colours under which the warriors of Islam had been wont to fight—the yellow of the Prophet himself, the green of the Fatimites, the white of the Ommiades, the black of the Abbassides,—the *Spahis* of the house of Othman reared that blood-red banner, so well known and so long feared in Christendom. For the service of the camp, a carriage train was organized of Christian followers, who, in consideration of the menial and burdensome duties to which they were bound, were exempt from tribute. The old law of the Koran was remembered and revived, which exacted a fifth of all the spoil, and a fifth of the price of every slave, for the use of the prince. A peace of six years was interposed in Amurath's conquests, and gave leisure, not only for the erection of mosques and palaces and baths in Adrianople, his new European capital, but for perfecting the military system, to which everything else was subordinate. The wily old man, Black Halil, who had suggested to Orchan the institution of the Janissaries, was in high power and confidence for twenty-seven of the thirty years of Amurath's reign; and the office of grand-vizier, which he bore for eighteen years, under the title of Haireddin Pasha, never went out of his family till after the fall of Constantinople. Even the Greek historians were impressed with his keen and far-sighted character, and record how carefully he was wont to impress upon Amurath, the necessity of preparing and proportioning his means and instruments for the high aim which he had before him. With such a counsellor, Amurath developed and matured the outlines of policy which Orchan had left him; and the men whose names are chiefly associated with his conquests, were mostly aged warriors, but energetic and able in their old age, who had passed their manhood as the servants of Orchan.

But it was not in Europe only that the Ottoman power was advancing with such vast strides. In Asia Minor, it rapidly absorbed two more of the smaller states, which had risen from the ruins of the Seljouks. The Emir of Kermian, the ancient

Digitized by Google

Phrygia, had to surrender his province as a marriage gift with his daughter to Amurath's son Bajazet; the Emir of Hamid, the old Pisidia, had to part with his by a forced sale. There was only one among these principalities which could pretend to measure itself with the Ottomans. The princes of Karaman occupied the plains of Iconium, the rugged masses of Taurus, and the shores of the Cilician sea. They had before shown jealousy of their rivals of the north-west. Amurath was provoked by their intrigues; and their submission was not timely enough to stop the march of an army, which he had collected for their chastisement, from his European dominions and allies, as well as from Asia. In 1386, on the field of Iconium, the Ottomans first tried their arms in a pitched battle against their Turkish brethren. The array of the Ottoman host on that decisive day is recorded, as the precedent which was ever after followed, in their many future battles. The feudal cavalry from Asia, as the fight was on their own ground, occupied the post of honour, the right wing—the troops from Europe the left—an order which was reversed, when European ground was the scene of battle. In the first line of the centre,—covered by a cloud of irregular skirmishers on foot, the *Azabs*,—stood, for the first time that history records, the 'new soldiers' raised from the Christian children in Black Halil's schools, the trained infantry of the Janissaries. Behind them was the post of the Sultan and Grand Vizier, surrounded by the squadrons of the regular cavalry of the guard, the paid *Spahis* and *Silihdars*. The Beglerbegs of Roumelia and Anatolia, the supreme military chiefs of the forces of Europe and Asia, commanded each on his own wing; but on this occasion, Amurath's two sons, Bajazet and Yacoub, were joined with them in command. The Karamanians were utterly routed; and on the field, the title of Vizier, and the distinguishing banner of the three horse-tails, were first conferred as a dignity of military honour, on Timurtash, the Beglerbeg of Roumelia, and the hero of the fight of Iconium. Amurath humbled, but was prevailed on to spare, the Emir and the state of Karaman; a storm was gathering behind him; and he had again to summon all his powers, both in Europe and Asia, to meet the danger, which was once more threatening from the banks of the Danube.

The Servians and their allies had been subdued, and Amurath had compelled Servian auxiliaries to help him against the Turks of Karaman; but the decisive trial of strength had not yet come, and the absence and occupation of Amurath in Asia, and perhaps the smart of Ottoman superiority, tempted them to enter the lists again, and for the last time, against their victorious competitor. Lazar, King of Servia,

Digitized by Google

the son of Stephen, gathered together the armies of the confederate Sclavonians from the gulf of Arta and the Croatian highlands, to the plains of the Theyss, and the mouths of the Danube. Seven tongues were spoken in his camp. There were Wallachians from beyond the Danube — Poles and Hungarians from beyond the Carpathians. The Tartars of the Dobruscha had been induced to revolt from the Ottomans; and the tribes which now furnish the fiercest soldiers, wherever the Turkish power requires the most daring and unscrupulous ferocity, the Albanian and Bosnian mountaineers, were then banded together with the kindred nations of Bulgaria and Servia, which have not, like them, accepted the faith with the yoke of their conquerors. The confederates hung on the edges of the Ottoman conquests, and defeated Ottoman armies; yet Amurath seemed hardly to heed them. He was busy with the affairs of his newly-acquired Asiatic provinces;—there he was occupied in celebrating at Brussa, with pompous ceremony, the circumcision of three of his grandchildren, and his own marriage, and that of his two sons, with Byzantine princesses. At last he moved. The forces of Asia Minor were once more poured across the Hellespont. With one wing of the army, his Grand Vizier, the son of Black Halil, crossed the Balkan, smote Bulgaria, and made it from that day a Turkish province. Then, through the rugged watercourses and intricate passes, in the heart and centre of the Sclavonic peninsula, where the mountain chains of Thrace and Macedonia are knotted together with the prolongations of the Dacian and Illyrian hills, Amurath pushed forward to seek the Servians. Old Evrenos, the apostate chief of Brussa, came back from a pilgrimage to Mecca, which he had just performed at the close of life, in testimony of his zeal for his second faith, to lend the Ottomans once more the renown of his formidable name, and to lead their vanguard. At Kossova, the '*Ousel's Field*,'[1] a pleasant plain in an amphitheatre of hills, where the borders of all the great Sclavonic provinces meet, the armies engaged. Of that stoutly contested battle, the issue was not doubtful, though a great price was paid for it by the conqueror. The life of the first invader of Europe was exacted, as the sacrifice due from the Ottomans for their first great European victory—but in that victory, the liberty of the Sclavonic tribes was struck down for centuries, and an omen given, of but too faithful presage, of the way in which Christian and Moslem were to meet afterwards in many a bloody field.

The histories and legends of both nations dwell upon, and perhaps exaggerate or overcolour the remembrances of this

[1] "*Amselfeld.*"—Von Hammer, ii. 174, 6.

Digitized by Google

eventful fight. On the eve of the battle, say the Turkish chroniclers, the mind of the stout-hearted Amurath for awhile misgave him. The banded Christian host, now that he had found it, barred his way with numbers greatly superior to his own. His army had marched far, and through rough and difficult ways; and now that the die was to be cast, the only chance left him was victory; for behind him, were the defiles of Rhodope and Hæmus, and all around, an unfriendly country. The Ottoman chiefs were divided in their counsels as to the method of attack, and night found them still disagreed. With the night came a violent wind, which drove the dust across the plain in stifling clouds into the faces of the Ottomans. Meanwhile, in the Christian camp, the proposal to take their enemies at disadvantage during the night, was rejected, for fear, it was urged, lest under the cover of darkness any of them should escape. The whole of the night Amurath spent in prayer, that if he might not conquer, he might at least have the privilege of dying a martyr for Islam. With the morning came a change: the clouds of dust which had swept over the field gave place to a soft rain; the view was cleared, and the Ottomans could see their opponents. Drawn up in the same order as at Iconium, they closed on the Christian army. The fight was obstinate and bloody: the iron mace of Prince Bajazet smote fierce and fast, and where he led, the yielding Ottomans rallied, and the Christians were scattered before the tempest of his attack; but the fortune of the day was long doubtful and threatening to Amurath, before their overthrow was completed and irretrievable. It had been almost accomplished, when, from the heaps of the slain, a Servian soldier started forth, and crying out that he had a secret message for Amurath, burst through the guards and orderlies to his person. Amurath suffered him to approach; the Servian bowed to kiss his foot, and as he raised himself, stabbed Amurath mortally. A man of prodigious strength and speed, the murderer sprang forth again through the circle of guards; three times his pursuers came up with him, and three times he shook them off; the fourth time, faint with his wounds, he was overpowered, and died under their swords. But Amurath had still strength to direct what remained to be accomplished of his victory. It was achieved while he yet lived. Lazar, the Servian king, was brought in prisoner to his tent: and while he was dying himself, Amurath ordered him to be slain, and looked on while he was put to death. Conqueror and conquered, each gazed with fierce triumph on the last moments of the other, and carried with them the certainty of his rival's fate.

Such are the Ottoman accounts of the fight of Kossova and the death of Amurath. The Servian legends and Greek historians give a different version of the deed of Milosch Kobilovitsch, the

Digitized by Google

soldier who avenged his nation's liberty on the conqueror who had struck it down. Milosch and Wuk Brancowich, say the Servian legends, had married the two daughters of King Lazar, and the sisters had quarrelled about the merit of their respective husbands. Brancowich, provoked by his own jealousy and the complaints of his wife, accused Milosch of treasonable correspondence with the Turks. On the eve of the battle, King Lazar was pledging his nobles to the morrow's good fortune, in the *Stravitza*, the silver goblet which he used; when he came to Milosch, he passed him the goblet, but reminded him that his good name was not untainted by suspicion. 'Thanks, O King, for the *Stravitza*,' said Milosch, 'to-morrow shall prove my truth.' In the morning, before the battle began, Milosch rode into the camp of the Ottomans as a deserter; and when he was brought into Amurath's tent, to kiss his foot, Milosch overturned his seat, and dealt him his death-wound. He rushed forth and reached the swift horse, which was waiting to carry him back to the Christian camp; but he had not time to mount before the sabres of the Janissaries hewed him down. The Turks then began the attack. But it was not till the evening, when King Lazar was brought in to die in the tent of his expiring enemy, that he learnt how Milosch Kobilovitsch had redeemed his pledge. With the Servians he is a patriot and an avenging hero; with the Ottomans, an assassin, whose crime was afterwards made the pretext of the insulting ceremonial, which obliged the ambassadors of Christian powers, to approach the Sultan with their arms held by attendant chamberlains. Yet even the Turks seem to have felt a kind of involuntary and admiring interest in the daring and strength which was so fatal to their great leader.[1] On the plain of Kossova, where a chapel marks the place where Amurath died, the Turks have set up three great stones, at intervals of fifty ells, to point out the spots where Milosch thrice sprang through the crowds of his pursuers; and in the old armoury at Constantinople, are still shown the arms and the trappings of the Servian champion and his war-horse.

Such was the first stage of that military empire which Orchan had planned for his house and race, and for which he had so patiently prepared. From the time when Amurath 'the Victorious' burst upon the Byzantine realm, it was clear that no power in the east of Europe was a match in battle for the combination of fierceness and discipline which was found alone among the Ottomans; as there was no dynasty or state which

[1] They are said to have shown the same feeling towards the remains and the name of their most successful opponent, Scanderbeg. When they took Alessio, they crowded round his tomb, to look on his corpse; and fragments of his bones, set in gold or silver, were worn by the Janissaries as relics or amulets.—Von Hammer, i. 545; Gibbon, c. 67.

Digitized by Google

aimed so high in its policy, and was filled with such confident and resolute enthusiasm of conquest. But the mounting fortunes and the strength of the new state were disclosed with more formidable certainty, amid the splendours, and still more, amid the vicissitudes of the reign of his successor Bajazet. Bajazet met at Nicopolis, not Asiatics, or Greeks, or Sclavonians, but the choicest and proudest chivalry of the West; and he trampled them down with an overthrow more humiliating and more cruel than that of Kossova. Till his last fatal field, no check suspended the proud and prosperous sweep of his victorious armies, from Widdin to the Morea, from Smyrna and Sinope to the Euphrates. Yet the victory of Nicopolis, and the ancient empire of the east in Europe and Asia once again united beneath his feet, are less striking proofs of the vigour of the Ottoman state, than the disasters of Angora. Few eastern dynasties, few nations anywhere, in the outset of their career, could have so endured the shock and strain of that memorable casting down of human pride. Bajazet himself became one of the household instances in all men's mouths, of the instability of the loftiest fortune. His power seemed to break in pieces and dissolve—its instruments and its seats were swept away under the hoofs of the Tartar horses. And when the tempest which had carried him along with it had passed over, Ottoman was ranged against Ottoman, Janissary against Spahi, while his sons tore among themselves what remained of the Ottoman dominions, and fought with one another for its ruins. Yet out of this wreck of public calamity and domestic war, the institutions of Orchan emerged unimpaired in form, and unaltered in spirit; the tenacious and elastic strength of his race rapidly recovered and collected itself; and from the confusion and disasters of that house, which seemed not only beaten down but divided against itself, arose in terrible energy and relentless purpose, the awful form of Mahomet the Conqueror.

A primitive and severe simplicity of habits had hitherto marked the Ottoman sovereigns. Unscrupulous in policy, reckless of blood, and fierce in their scorn of those whom they had destined for their slaves, they were yet largely imbued with what religious tempers the Koran can infuse; it speaks much of kindness and mercy to the needy, and of rigorous justice even to the stranger; and they had gained renown even among their enemies for both. Nor, while displaying magnificence in their public constructions and foundations, had they yet been tempted to leave their ancestral homeliness; and copy the barbaric gorgeousness of Oriental state. Once only a whim of Amurath prompted him to add a slight ornament to the severe plainness of his attire. At the plunder of a town he discovered and exposed

Digitized by Google

the device of one of his soldiers, to secrete a golden cup, by placing it on his head, and covering it with his head-dress; Amurath chose to be amused at the trick, and in his merriment to imitate the soldier, and set the fashion of wearing a gold embroidered cap beneath the white linen of his turban. And his illiterate rudeness, ostentatiously affected, if it was not real, is still commemorated in the *Tughra* or sign manual of his more polished successors—the Arabic letters of their name and style are interwoven into a rude outline of the impression of a human hand, in remembrance of the way in which Amurath, like the shepherd kings of Tartary, the Mongol conquerors, and Timour, ratified his treaties, by dipping his palm into the ink, and leaving the print of it on the instrument. But under Bajazet, the effect was seen of unbroken and marvellous success, of increasing wealth and strength, on natures still steeped in the ignorance, and instinct with the savage and untamed wildness, of the steppes of Central Asia. The pride and the dazzling pomp, the cold deliberate ferocity, the monstrous lust of blood, the deep insolent perfidy, the foul and unnameable sensuality, thinly disguised under a veil of grave and manly courtesy, which have marked almost every Ottoman sovereign, and certainly every period of Ottoman power, appear already in their hateful combination, if not yet in their full proportions, in the Court of Bajazet.

'The reign of Bajazet Ilderim, "the Thunderbolt,"' says Von Hammer, 'begins, like the history of the world, with fratri-'cide. Scarcely had his father breathed forth his spirit, than 'Bajazet ordered his brother to be put to death'—the brother who had shared with him, the day before, the perils and the toil of the hard-fought field of Kossova. 'He did this,' says the official historiographer of the Ottoman empire, Seadeddin, who proclaims it his duty only to record the facts which set forth the honour of the noble house of Othman—he did this 'in con-'sideration of the text of the Koran, "*Disturbance is worse than* '*putting to death:*"—in consideration of the evil example given by 'his brother Saudschi of conspiracy and rebellion, that such an 'example might not find an imitator:—and in consideration of the 'example which ought to be followed, of God, who is alone, and 'without a rival; wherefore also the shadow of God upon earth, 'the Ruler of the Faithful, ought, like God, to govern on his 'throne without companionship and without rivalry.' 'The rea-'sons which influenced Bajazet,' continues Von Hammer, 'were 'found so weighty by the succeeding sultans, that his example 'was followed as a rule; and afterwards, in the legislation of 'Mahommed the Conqueror, the murder of the brethren of the 'Sultan was publicly proclaimed to be the law of the kingdom.'

The vassalage of the Servians, and other Sclavonian tribes,

Digitized by Google

which followed on the battle of Kossova, gave Bajazet an undisputed preeminence in the East; but the rout and massacre of Nicopolis at once spread his name and terror throughout Europe. In the most disastrous days of the Crusades, the pride of the nobles of the West had not been taught so terrible a lesson by the Infidels of Asia. A momentary pause in the confusions of the Great Schism, and the civil wars of France, had left them free to seek the excitement of an Eastern adventure. At Pentecost in 1396, a gay and princely company met at Vienna, whom Sigismund of Hungary, the future emperor of Germany, had invited to accompany him to chastise the hordes which were riding along the Danube, and to sweep them out of Christendom. In it were heard some of the most famous names and noblest titles of France, Burgundy, and Flanders: D'Eu, De la Marche, and Bar, belonged to the blood royal of France; St. Pol, De la Trémouille, Sampi, and De Couci, to its most high-born lordly houses; John de Vienne, the Admiral,—John Boucicaut, the Marshal of France, were captains renowned in the wars and councils of the West; the men-at-arms and squires, whom they brought with them, were picked men of the tried and fiery knighthood of their gallant land; at their head was a grandson of France and heir of Burgundy, known then as the Count of Nevers, but afterwards as *Jean sans Peur*,[1] reserved to be the father of mighty princes,—to be the troubler and scourge of his country,—to be able to daunt a council of the Church from condemning the doctrine of tyrannicide, and ruin the greatest theologian of his age, John Gerson, for denouncing it,—and to end and expiate his guilty and blood-stained life, by being himself its victim on the bridge of Montereau. Nor were the noble names of Germany absent. A Hohen-Zollern led knights from the Rhine; the Count Palatine, from Bavaria; Herman of Cilli, from Styria; and with them was the Grand Master of Rhodes, and a numerous company of the Knights of St. John. On St. Michael's eve, they met the foes they had come to seek on the Danube. Headstrong and insolent, 'despising their enemies and their allies,' scorning the caution prompted by Sigismund's dearly-bought experience of Turkish war, confident in their mail of proof and their western spears, they rose up from their wine and debauchery, and the perfidious slaughter of their captives, to look for and ride down the Infidel rabble rout[2] who had terrified the East.

[1] When the Count de Nevers was brought before Bajazet, after the battle of Nicopolis, 'disoit-on communement, qu'il y eut un Sarrasin, nommé Nigromancien, devin, ou sorcier, qui dist qu'en le sauvast, et qu'il estoit taillé de faire mourir plus de Chrestiens que le Basac (Bajazet), ny tous ceux de leur loy ne sçauraient faire.'—Juvenal des Ursins. 1396.

[2] 'Cette chiennaille.'—Mém. de Boucicaut, c. xxv.

Digitized by Google

They encountered a well-ordered and well-prepared army, whose warlike and brilliant show equalled their own. A swarm of light-horsemen covered the Ottoman lines, and concealed what they were doing. As the French advanced, the light-horsemen swept off right and left like a dispersing cloud, and disclosed, behind a fence of thickly-planted stakes, which had been fixed under the cover of their skirmishing, a long line of infantry, from whom a storm of arrows poured into the faces of the French cavalry. But through the deadly arrow-flights, through the barrier of sharp and slanting stakes, among which men and horses were maimed, they pushed on in spite of great loss; then, before their thundering onset and levelled spears, even the Janissaries, who never fled, were broken and overthrown. The first line of their enemies was destroyed, and the horsemen, who had taken refuge behind it, scattered; but the French could not halt, and a second line of stout and fierce infantry awaited them. As riders and horses, in disorder and out of breath, mounted the crest of a rising ground, they came upon Bajazet, and with him, not on the wreck and remains, but on the masses, fresh and untouched, of the main body of his host. At once, a 'forest of lances' closed round the loose array and exhausted strength of that troop of knights. They fought fiercely and terribly in their despair, but they could charge no longer; they were hemmed in, entangled, jammed together, stifled, by the surging throng and press of the storming Turkish squadrons. They were crushed and broken down, says the report of one who saw the scene, 'like the iron on the anvil.'[1] The Hungarians, far behind, and panic-struck, when they saw the French cavalry struggling in the toils,—led also, it is said, by faithless generals,—broke and fled. But Sigismund's guards, with the soldiers from Bavaria and Styria, yet formed a strong and formidable body, and advanced to extricate and relieve their comrades. They, too, were at first successful, till a fierce onset on their flank overthrew them. Sigismund, when his royal banner was struck down, escaped, with a few companions, by means of a small boat, on the Danube. But the Christian host was no more; and those of the French and German nobles who were not lying on the field, were prisoners in the hands of Bajazet. On the morrow came a more dreadful scene. Bajazet was furious at the massacre of the Turkish captives by the French nobles, and at his losses on the field. Sitting at his tent door, he ordered the whole body of prisoners to be collected from every part of the camp before him. Two of those who were present and escaped,

[1] Mém. de Boucicaut.

Digitized by Google

have left behind their remembrances of that day of humiliation and blood.[1] The 'noble youths of the Fleur-de-Lys,' honoured and high-spirited children of the lineage and royal blood of France, were tied tightly with cords by the 'ugly and horrible Saracens,' who held them with 'hard and rough grasp before the tyrant as he sat.' He granted their lives to the Count de Nevers, and twenty-four of his noblest companions, and bade them sit on the ground at his feet. Then he ordered the whole number of the remaining prisoners to be slain before him. They were brought up one by one, or stood in lines, as they were tied; and the club, or the sharp heavy yataghan,[2] passed along from head to head. The number of the victims varies, in different accounts, from three hundred to ten-thousand; but one of our informants, an eye-witness, the German Schildberger, who was saved by the son of Bajazet for his extreme youth, and returned an old man to Nuremberg to write the story of that horrible morning, says, that at sun-rise the work of death began, and that when it was stopped, at the entreaties of the Turkish chiefs, wearied and sickened of its horrors, it was already four hours after noon. As Boucicaut, the Marshal of France, approached in the sad procession, and his turn was rapidly drawing near, his eyes met those of the Count de Nevers.[3] The Count cast a piteous look at Bajazet, and joined the fingers of his hands, to signify that Boucicaut was as a brother to him. Bajazet understood the sign, and Boucicaut was spared, to share the count's captivity, and, at last, after losing once more his liberty in a more famous battle than even Nicopolis, to die a prisoner in England.[4] Such was the end of that gallant company. At Pentecost they had met at Vienna. On Christmas night, while the gay court of the King of France was holding a brilliant festival at Paris, a horseman, booted and spurred, rode into the Hotel S. Pol, and kneeling before the king, delivered the message, that the corpses of the French host were lying unburied on the banks of the Danube,[5] and that the few survivors, and among them five princes of his own race, were waiting for their ransom in the prisons of Brusa. France and Flanders were thrown into mourning. And the first of those degrading tributes of money and presents, with which the great kings of the West used, from time to time, to deprecate the hostility and

[1] Schildberger and Boucicaut; supposing that the writer of Boucicaut's Memoirs had the account from himself, which is probable. Cf. *Notice sur Boucicaut*, (*Collection Michaud et Poujoulat*,) ii. p. 212.

[2] 'Grands cousteaux.'—Boucicaut.

[3] 'Dieu fait, que le Comte de Nevers, sur le point que on vouloit ferir sur luy le va regarder moult piteusement, et le mareschal luy.'—Boucicaut.

[4] Gibbon *kills* him at Agincourt; but it is a mistake. Cf. *Notice sur Boucicaut*, p. 212.

[5] Juvenal des Ursins. 1396.

Digitized by Google

feed the insolence of the Turks, was offered at the Porte of Bajazet by the most ancient royal house in Christendom, to redeem the captives of Nicopolis.

For twelve years nothing interrupted the uniform course of Bajazet's conquests. In Asia he finished what his predecessors had begun, the reunion under one sway of all the fragments of the old Seljouk kingdom. The principalities of the coast were finally extinguished. Karaman was conquered, and its chief put to death; and from the shores of Cilicia, Bajazet turned to those of the Euxine, to punish and dispossess the Isfendiars of Kastemuni, the lords of old Paphlagonia, for having harboured the fugitive princes of the Ægean coasts. The shelterers were driven from Sinôpe and Amasia, as the sheltered had been driven from Smyrna and Ephesus, to seek and raise up an avenger, in the midst of that dark tempest of desolating conquest, which was raging in the depth of Asia, and in which a mightier than Bajazet was drawing near, amid the ruins of the kingdoms of the East. Nothing daunted by the portentous renown of Timour, Bajazet advanced eastwards, till the northern Euphrates became his border. In Europe, Servia, and Wallachia, were his tributaries. His fortified posts on the Danube were pushed upwards to Widdin, and the Turkish marauders began to feel their way into the unexplored lands of Hungary and Styria. Southwards, he plunged into Thessaly and Greece, offended with the Greek emperor, or in search of new hunting-grounds;[1] the instigator and guide of his march was a Greek and a churchman, the traitor Bishop of Phocis. This time there was no one to defend Thermopylæ, and Bajazet received the homage of the Greek and Frankish chiefs who ruled in Phocis and Bœotia; while the unwearied Evrenos, that implacable old man against his former race and faith, who, under Amurath, had firmly fixed the Ottoman horsetails on the banks of the Macedonian Axius, now carried them forward over the unguarded Isthmus, to the citadel of Argos and the waters of the Gulf of Coron. In this visitation—for it was not yet a conquest—Athens was not spared: and though the Ottomans for the present retired, they swept off with them a booty of 30,000 slaves, whom they fixed as a colony in Asia, in the same way as they had planted Asiatic colonies at the gates of Constantinople, and in the plains of Thrace.

If Bajazet judged of the nations of the West from his past experience of the spirit and wisdom of his Christian foes, it is easy to understand the words of scorn and menace, with which he is said to have dismissed his prisoners.[2] For in

[1] Finlay; Von Hammer.

[2] Cf. Gibbon, chap. lxiv. p. 72.

Digitized by Google

the East, he had not only conquered the Christians,—he had forced them to fight his battles against their fellow-Christians, not in the ranks of the Janissaries merely, but under their own banner of the Cross. The charge which finally crushed the Christian host at Nicopolis, was made by Christian troops led by the Christian chief of Servia, the son of him who had been slaughtered in Amurath's tent at Kossova, the grandson of Stephen Dushan, but now the brother-in-law and sworn liegeman of Bajazet. For the Palæologi at Constantinople a lower depth of infamy was reserved. It was not only, that Bajazet made and unmade Cæsars at his pleasure,—deposed, imprisoned, and then caused the occupant of the throne and the dungeon to change places again; it was not only, that he compelled them to receive a Mahometan kadi, and to allow a Mahometan mosque to be built within the imperial city,—it was not only, that when the Emperors had pulled down three famous churches to fill up a gap in the ruined city walls, they submissively obeyed his prohibition to add any new fortifications to Constantinople, and razed to the ground, at his order, what they had just built; it was not only, that the smallest disobedience was at once punished by a strict and prolonged blockade—the ignominy of the Greek emperors yet wanted something to complete it. A single Greek city, which had stood the brunt of more than one fierce storm, still raised itself above the ruins of the empire. Alascher, the ancient Philadelphia, was a great staple of trade, and, in the very heart of the Turkish conquests, was still a free town. Bajazet wanted lands and houses, to form the endowment of his new mosque at Adrianople; and he led his army against Philadelphia. The Greek vassal emperors, with their troops, were with him. It was Manuel, the Greek emperor, who summoned Philadelphia to receive the Turkish yoke. When Philadelphia resolved to defend its freedom, it was the Greek emperors and Greek soldiers who were appointed, and who undertook, to conduct the siege. Lastly—what would be beyond belief, if a Greek chronicler[1] had not related it—'it was John and Manuel, the Greek emperors, who led the 'assault against their own city, to deliver it into the hands of 'the barbarians.'[2]

The shadows of ancient greatness still lingered and flitted in its decaying palaces, or wandered, unhonoured suppliants, with their piteous tale of woe and shame, among the courts of the West; or in ludicrous mockery of their fallen state, emulously multiplied themselves in the still shrinking limits of their narrow corner in Thrace, and contending Cæsars reigned, not

[1] Chalcocondylas. [2] Von Hammer, i. 185.

Digitized by Google

only at Constantinople, but a score of miles off, at Selymbria. But the substance of power in what was wont to be considered the Eastern world, was in Bajazet's court, the Sultan's Gate, at Brusa. Bajazet had traversed the countries from Germany to Armenia, from the Carpathians to Persia and the Syrian desert, and had not yet found a rival; and now he stood, careless of the wild storm which was bursting over Asia, only waiting to arise and be the scourge of the sins and divisions, the scandals and confusions, of Western Christendom. And under him was now seen at Brusa, not only the substance but the show of a power, which served itself of the wealth and strength of many races of men. The Ottomans had long been rapacious—had long been overbearing—had long been insolent: they now exhibited, in rapid and premature development, the display and the corruption of secure prosperity. The profuse and pompous magnificence, and the greediness after money at the expense of public interest and private honour, which are such prominent features in almost all the great men of the Ottomans, began to show themselves in the reign of Bajazet. The son of the great Black Halil, Bajazet's chief minister and friend, was not above receiving a bribe from the Greek Emperor, to give a respite to Constantinople. Bajazet's glory and show in the hunting-field were the wonder of his French captives, the kinsmen of the gayest and of the wealthiest of European princes; but the fiery Bajazet, whose joy seemed the battle, and who owed his fame and his power to his army, left his soldiers without pay at the very crisis of his fortune, and grudged his treasures to them, even in the moment of peril, with the close-handed and shortsighted thrift of a miserly usurer. We still hear, indeed, of Ottoman justice; but Bajazet's, if we are to judge from the well-known stories[1] which illustrate it, was but the blind ferocity of a provoked barbarian. What is more certain than Bajazet's justice is the licentiousness, of which he gave the example and became the precedent. Bajazet, the first of the Ottoman princes, gave the rein to his wild nature, in pleasure as well as in ambition or revenge. A Moslem prince, he learnt from one of his Christian wives, and added to the sensuality of Asia, the drunken orgies of the West. But this was the least. It was in Bajazet's court that the seeds were sown, which took root so early and grew with the growth of the Ottoman State, of that unnameable system of public and unexampled profligacy—which remains to this day its burning and characteristic shame, and its incurable curse—that system of official promotion, which made the infamy

[1] See Gibbon, chap. lxiv.; vol. viii. p. 68.

Digitized by Google

of youth the ordinary path to the honours of manhood, and to the first places of the State. It was one of the immediate fruits of the policy, which led the Ottomans to recruit their strength in the families of the Christians they had conquered. The tribute of Christian children, not only filled the chambers of the Janissaries with recruits, but the Sultan's halls with pages. It is reported that the heinous taint which spread from the Court involved all the orders and classes, by whom the Ottoman State was supported and guided; and that foremost among the corrupt and the corrupting, were not merely all-powerful viziers and lawless soldiers, but the grave and solemn teachers and ministers of the Mahomedan law.[1]

'Bajazet sat at Brusa,' says one of the Greek chroniclers, in his flowery style, 'and the lofty tree of his prosperity was 'laden with fruit. Nothing of all the things which can give 'most exquisite enjoyment was wanting to him. Wild beasts of 'strange shapes, precious metals, and all that God has created 'most rare for the delight of the eyes, were found in his trea-'sure houses. Choicest slaves, men and women, of fair form 'and beautiful countenance, stood round him—they were 'Greeks, Servians, Wallachians, Albanians, Hungarians, Saxons, 'Bulgarians, Latins—who all sang and made music, each in 'their own language, however little heart they might have for it. 'But he sat in the midst of them, and gave himself up without 'interruption to the enjoyment of soft voluptuousness.'[2]

One thing only impeached the perfect splendour of his prosperity. At his very gates, enclosed and straitened by his ample conquests, the ruins and spoils of its worn-out empire, a great and venerable name still claimed the honours of twenty centuries, and maintained its precedence among Eastern princes, by the possession of a royal city, which seemed the symbol and pledge of Eastern dominion. True, Bajazet had held its keys; he had changed its rulers; he had put it to tribute; he had led forth its Cæsars among his other vassals, against their own less compliant towns. But it was not less true, that the lord still sat at Brusa, and the vassal in the imperial palaces of Constantinople; it was not less true, that the owner of Constantinople was, in the view, not only of Western princes and Western merchants, but of Bajazet's own subjects, the rightful Emperor of the East. And under Bajazet's own eyes, that single but splendid relic of greatness, itself more than half the empire, had been transferred without his leave, from one to another, by the helpless pretenders to the name of Cæsar; and when one of them could no longer hold it, he devolved his right, and united

[1] Von Hammer, i. 192. [2] Ducas, in Von Hammer, i. 209.

Digitized by Google

the rival diadems of Selymbria and Constantinople, on the head of a blind and feeble pensioner of the Ottoman conqueror. The 'sick man's heritage,' according to the memorable phrase of modern days, invited the hand of his successor. Orchan and Amurath had each successively added a nobler capital to their dominions. It seemed reserved for Bajazet to outshine their exploits, and accomplish their work, by raising up the 'Gate' and throne of the Turcoman lords of the 'Black Castle,' within the precincts of the palace of the Cæsars, and by having the weekly prayer of the Moslems recited in his own name, and to the honour of the Arabian Prophet, in the oldest Cathedral in Christendom.

It seemed the triumph reserved for Bajazet; and in the first year of the fifteenth century he prepared to claim it. The blind John of Selymbria reigned in Constantinople, while his cousin and rival Manuel was vainly imploring help among the courts of Europe. Bajazet sent to John: 'Not for thy 'sake, but for my own,' he said, 'have I cast out thy prede-'cessor. Art thou our friend?—then remove from the city, 'and choose thee a province where thou wilt, and I will bestow 'it on thee to govern. But if not, I swear by God, and our 'Prophet, that I will spare no one. All shall utterly perish.'

As at the last, when the last *did* arrive, so now, when it seemed come,—a burst of brave resolution flashed up in the moment of utmost peril, amid the decay and ignominy of the Greek race. Constantinople sent back an answer worthy of her history and name, to the summons of the barbarian: 'Go tell your master,' said its people, 'that we are indeed without help. We have 'no defender, to whose might we can look for protection, except 'God—God, who upholds the helpless, and overthrows the 'strong. Now do thy pleasure.' And they and their proud enemy prepared for the encounter.

But the encounter was not to be. That generation was to be sleeping in its graves, before the change, which seemed at the very doors, should come; they were to be spared the shame, or denied the triumph, of seeing a new dynasty enthroned on the Golden Horn. The crash of a tremendous revolution was, indeed, to startle the world; but it was the downfal of its most rising power, not the extinction of one long doomed to ruin.

Bajazet was called away from Constantinople to meet the challenge of a rival conqueror, of his own faith and stock, but one before whose terrible ambition and greatness Bajazet is dwarfed and overshadowed, and his broad Ottoman realm dwindles down into the dimensions of a province. Timour was the last and the most remarkable of those Tartar wan-

Digitized by Google

derers, in whom the boundless and lawless liberty of the Steppes awakened the dream of the mastery of the world; who, driven onwards by a frenzied and devouring enthusiasm that could not stop, and bursting by their grim energy through all that barred their way, were able for a time to bind the civilization of Asia to the throne of the Northern wilderness: and who, even after that throne had crumbled, left indelible traces of their character, their deeds and thoughts, on the memory, the history, and the legislation of the polished races of the South. Timour held the conquerors' spell over his savage brethren. Lured by that spell from their bleak, endless plains, and forbidding wastes, their roaming camps were once more gathered together for battle, under a chief who was able to break them to his discipline, and bend them as one man to the single aim of his vast ambition. Once more, and for the last time, the Mongol war cry of '*forwards*'[1] passed from land to land, across the Oxus, across the Volga, across the Euphrates, across the Indus, and at last across the Halys. About the time that Amurath the Victorious led the Ottomans into Europe, Timour began to conquer. While they had been advancing from the Hellespont to the Danube and the Euphrates, Timour had dashed to pieces power after power, from the deserts of Tartary to those of Arabia, from the shores of the Caspian to the fountains of the Ganges; he went onward, where Alexander and Genghis had turned back; the historic lands of Asia, the seats of her proudest kingdoms, the cradles and homes of her highest civilization—Persia and Chaldæa, Armenia and Hindostan—were joined in a common wreck with the barbarian thrones of Turkistan and Russia, to form a Tartar empire; over their impregnable fortresses, their fairest and greatest cities, Ispahan, Bagdad, Delhi, Damascus, his sword had passed, like the lightning or the pestilence, and left them without man or beast, marked by their reeking walls and pyramids of human skulls;—spoiled, that by their arts and industry Samarcand might be adorned; ruined, that Samarcand might be left standing alone, the one great city of the Tartar reign; while during the forty years that his armies traversed to and fro, and his horse-hoofs marked the soil, the lands of civilized man—of those who are nourished by the wheatsheaf, the vine, and the olive—tilth and garden, orchard and watered meadow, seemed yielding to the encroachments of his native steppe, to furnish hunting-grounds for his game, or unpeopled pastures for the horses and flocks, whose flesh and milk were the food of his race. The perfect and favourite number of the Tartars, nine, had been all but fulfilled

[1] 'Sürün:' Von Hammer, i. 223, 249.

Digitized by Google

and multiplied in the dynasties he had annihilated, and the crowns he had united on his head; *almost* nine princely houses, thrice nine separate lands, were reckoned when he told the sum of his conquests,—one more great family was wanting to complete the tale, when he marched against Bajazet; and the dynasty of the Ottomans made the ninth.

Such was the fierce destroyer of men, whom Bajazet had now to meet; a grimly earnest, lame old man, with long white hair, hair which had been white from his infancy, flowing from his massy head and open brow,[1]—a man who hated jests and lies,—grave and weighty in his sayings, finding his solace in complicated games of chess, or in discussing with his scheiks abstruse and thorny questions of theology or casuistry; a man who never forgot, never desisted, never regretted the past or repented of what he had done:—a man before whom the gems and gold of Asia had been showered, and who had all its glories and delights at his command; yet after nearly half a century of war and victory—war almost without a break, and victory without a reverse—was neither enervated nor wearied:—who was to go on till his last breath, conquering, planning, and building up with restless and sagacious energy—whose organizing mind had covered Asia with a network of rapid communications and watchful intelligencers, and had introduced obedience, subordination, a regular array and equipment, and a method of systematic and well-imagined tactics, among his swarming hordes; who spent his life in wasting Asia, yet was full of wise thoughts of statesmanship, and is named as one of the founders and sources of Asiatic law:—a man, merciless as death, to whose horrible butcheries of his Moslem brethren, the bloody morrow of Nicopolis seems but an excusable catastrophe of war; yet who professed the stern piety and benevolence of the Koran, who deigned to disclaim the character of a man of blood, and to throw the burden of what he had shed on his enemies; and who, in the height of his pride, took pleasure in contrasting the magnificence of his fortune with his crippled body, and in ostentatiously confessing that in all that he had achieved or won, he felt himself but the frail and feeble instrument of the hand of God.

Nearly forty years before, Ottomans and Mongols had each gone on their way to conquer; at the end of that time they met. It was but natural that the conqueror, who had spared no Mahometan house or kingdom, and who had been driven by the frenzy of universal dominion to the plains of India and the wastes of Russia, should refuse to turn back from any boundary that his horses could overleap or swim. Yet Timour does

[1] Von Hammer, i. 212.

Digitized by Google

appear to have been indisposed to break in on the territories of the Ottomans. He came, and marked his coming by the destruction of a great city, and then turned away; and Bajazet seems to have wantonly tempted and drawn aside the tempest from its path. At any rate, if the shock must have come, and his last and proudest crown had still to be won by Timour, either by voluntary homage or war, he was not suffered to want a pretext by the insolence of Bajazet. Irritating messages and words of scorn were exchanged by both; but the pride of Timour was dignified and self-possessed, compared with the furious and frantic defiance of the most sacred laws of Eastern right and courtesy, which Bajazet displayed to the ambassadors and the personal honour of Timour. 'The son of Murad is mad,' he said, when the last insult that an Oriental can offer or endure was cast in his face; and he gave the decisive order to go forward against Anatolia. Bajazet, who had the city of the Cæsars in his grasp, who had been dreaming of planting his horsetails even in their Western seat, could only be brought to look upon Timour as an adventurous and lucky freebooter of the desert. His soldiers were murmuring for their pay, and he refused to open his treasures. His chiefs warned him of the numbers of the invading cavalry, and urged him to avoid the plains and occupy the passes and the hills; but his only care was to find and exterminate them in open battle. He hastened to the frontier. They too were hastening on; they swept forward, and passed him far on his flank; and when he had lost their trace, and was waiting for them to appear, he heard of them many marches behind him. They were between him and his capital, assailing the great fortress of Angora which defends the road. He had to seek them once more in the very heart of his dominions. This time they did not disappoint him. He found the Tartar host well posted, entrenched, and ready. In the infatuation of his pride, to exhibit before their eyes his scorn of their power, he exhausted his already wearied soldiers with the vainglorious spectacle of an Oriental hunting-party. The Tartars, meanwhile, were busy in cutting off or spoiling the water-springs by which the Ottomans were supplied. Then came the day of battle. It would be a perilous attempt to estimate the numbers on an eastern battle-field, described by eastern chroniclers. But there can be no doubt that many years had passed, since a muster and a shock, like that of the Mongol and Ottoman powers on the plains of Angora, had been witnessed in the East. There, in Bajazet's line of battle, were arrayed—Christians and Moslems once more together—the conquerors of Nicopolis; on the left, Stephen, with his black Servian cuirassiers, who had broken the last reserves of the Hungarian army; and in

Digitized by Google

the centre the compact and stubborn lines of the Janissaries. But on Bajazet's right, were masses of the unsteady and discontented troops of Asia, whose hereditary princes were in the camp of Timour, and Tartar colonists from Thrace, won over by Timour's emissaries to the side of their former kinsmen. A stately array of elephants is said to have formed the van of Timour's army; but his real strength was the broad and open plain. There his overwhelming numbers found space and play for the unrelaxing impetuosity of their successive charges. They overlapped, they tore asunder the Ottoman line; they surrounded, they burst, in repeated assaults, on its divided fragments. Large bodies of the Asiatic troops, with the Tartar auxiliaries, went over to Timour. The Servian horsemen fought hard and dangerously, but they were wedged together by swarming throngs, as the French knights had been at Nicopolis, and perished as they did. Stephen, on his barbed war-horse, broke through the press, and made his way to where Bajazet had retired to a rising ground, and with the impenetrable and unshaken Janissaries maintained the conflict, when it had ceased everywhere else. Stephen urged Bajazet to escape, but he refused. Despair or hope still bound him to that fated field, where his bravest and his dearest dared not abide with their master and father. All fled before the inevitable ruin—chiefs like Stephen and Evrenos, officers like the Grand Vizier, the Aga of the Janissaries, the Captain of the Horse-guards—his surviving sons, each as chance opened a way through the Tartars, one westward to Europe, another eastward to the Pontic mountains, another southward to the crags of Taurus. But all day long, from morning to nightfall, under the blazing July sun,[1] the Janissaries, faint with thirst, and falling fast under the Tartar onslaughts, held on without flinching, for the last chance of retrieving their master's fortune; and he held on with them. But that fortune, so dazzling and so unchequered, had that day run out its term. Night came down on his thinned and sinking footmen, and he saw that on the field there was nothing more to be done. He was persuaded to mount and fly. But beyond the spears of the Janissaries, the Tartar horsemen were masters of the plain. His horse stumbled or stopped to drink; and he was taken. The titular head of the royal tribe of the Mongols, the lineal heir of Genghis, now a vassal chief in the Tartar host, led the Sultan of the Ottomans to the tent of his conqueror.

It is credible, and quite consonant with Eastern feelings, and with Timour's character, that he was received with proud and grave courtesy. When Timour's fury had spent itself, he was the

[1] 28th July, 1402.

Digitized by Google

man to eye curiously and moralize with irony on the monument before him of the strange mixtures and alternations in man's lot. He made Bajazet, it is related, seat himself on the carpet next himself, and conversed with him on the incidents of the fight. Then he allowed his thoughts to flow, on that mighty share of power which he had that day confirmed, and which Bajazet had the same day forfeited. 'Thou and I,' he said, 'owe great and special thanks 'to God the Lord, for the dominion which he has granted to 'us.' 'Why so?' said the prisoner. 'Because he has divided it 'between two such people as we—a lame man like me, and a 'gouty one like you: to the lame man he has given all from 'India to Sivas, and to the gouty one all from Sivas to 'Hungary. Surely this leaves no doubt, what the dominion of 'the world is worth in the eyes of God. If it had not been less 'than nothing, he would have shared it between men sound of 'body and whole of limb, not between a pair of cripples, like 'you and me. But because thou hast been unthankful to God, 'and not acknowledged His benefits, He has sent this chastise-'ment by *my* hand, the rod of His anger. Yet take it not to 'heart, brother Bajazet. If a man keeps but safe and sound, 'he soon comes back to fortune and blessing.' But the words of the conqueror, jesting in the moment of triumph with his own prosperity, are no real proof of the clemency or generosity of the man. Modern criticism has indeed changed the *iron cage* into a closed and latticed litter, and traced the origin of a world-wide story to a confusion between two like-sounding words. But Bajazet was impatient of captivity, and Timour was resolved to display his captive in the streets of Samarcand. The harshness of the imprisonment no doubt increased, as the prisoner tried to break from it. And the natural scorn of the strong and unrelenting barbarian, for what he had overthrown and ruined, for the helplessness which was before his eyes every day, soon broke out and overrode all temporary sentiment about the vanity of human greatness. Bajazet had been a passionate and famous hunter: Timour sent him a present of hounds and hawks, to mock him with the remembrances of his days of freedom. And more than this, the women of Bajazet's harem, and even one of his legitimate wives, were dragged forth in public at the Tartar's banquet, and forced to serve wine to his guests. Bajazet was carried about in Timour's train, as he slowly turned back to Samarcand. But he died in Asia Minor, before the year of his captivity was out. 'God's we are,' said Timour, 'and to God we return,' when he was told of Bajazet's death; and four days after, he received, with the same words, the announcement of the death of his own favourite grandson. He gave Bajazet's remains to his son Musa; and his tomb was raised like

Digitized by Google

those of his fathers, by the mosque which he had built, amid the groves and rushing waters of Brusa. Yet one more humiliation, the last that man, and the bitterest that Moslem can go through, was reserved to complete the reversal of his fortune. Alone of all the Ottoman princes, the proud and brilliant Bajazet was not allowed his last rest, amid the great dead of his line and race. In the confusion which followed his death, a chief of Karaman, of that family which Bajazet had crushed and disinherited, was able to take vengeance for the misfortunes of his house, in the city and at the grave of their destroyer; and in Brusa, Bajazet's chosen seat of glory and delight, his tomb was violated and overthrown, his corpse torn up, burnt, and its ashes scattered, that it might never again be restored to its resting-place, to give a savage triumph to a spiteful rebel.

Athens after Syracuse, Rome after Cannæ, France after Waterloo, were not so shattered and laid low as the Ottoman state was after the rout of Angora. Just a hundred years before, it had begun to be. In the first years of the fourteenth century, Othman became an independent chief, in an obscure castle on the borders of Bithynia. In the first years of the fifteenth, his descendants were crushed under the iron might of Timour. In the interval they had achieved an empire. And now it seemed as if the course of their empire were run, like that of so many fortunate and short-lived Asiatic dynasties; that the time was come for it to fall in pieces, and give place to another, or be frittered away in the hands of a number of quarrelsome and impotent local chiefs. For half a century the event seemed to hang in the balance. Desperate efforts, perilous struggles, compliances, submissions, and yieldings to the time, which would have provoked the indignation of Orchan and the first Amurath, marked the period; one hard and anxious trial of strength came at its close; and then the Ottoman power emerged, compact, invincible, and more terrible than before, to resume its career and accomplish its strange destiny, and long confront, with threatening and with scorn, the greatest and strongest polities of the rising civilization of Western Christendom.

The Tartar hordes pushed westwards till they were stopped by the broad Hellespont and the Ægean. They spoiled Brusa and its treasures, and burnt its mosques and schools; a storm and a massacre left Smyrna in ruins and blood; and then the devastating wave swept backwards, from the provinces over which it had broken, to roll to the other extremity of Asia, and menace China. But before Timour had departed, all humbled themselves before him, and acknowledged his supremacy. Soleiman, the son of Bajazet, safe behind the sea in his palace at Adrianople, yet asked and received the investiture of the

Digitized by Google

lordship of the Ottomans and of the kingdom of Roum, in a charter impressed with the print of the red hand of the Mongol.[1] Timour, it is said, had graciously received the prayer of Bajazet, that he would not root out his posterity, nor utterly destroy a race which was the bulwark and hope of the Moslems. From the Cæsar of Constantinople he received, before he departed, the tribute of the conquered—from the Sultan of Egypt, the submission of a vassal; and in the mosques and mints of Cairo, prayer was said, and coin struck, in the imperial name of Timour. The consolidating work of the Ottoman conquerors in Asia Minor was broken up and thrown back for many years. The Turkish principalities, which had been fused together under their sway, were again divided under their restored dynasties; and Timour left the Ottomans of Brusa, once more, what they had been under their first Emir, but one among the fragments of the Seljouk kingdom.

All had to be begun again in the Ottoman State; and *it did* begin again with a fierce war of succession, among the sons of Bajazet, whom the overthrow of Angora had hurled apart, to different parts of his ruined dominions. There still survived the emblem and the refuge of the unity of the State, in the court and capital of Adrianople. There, the 'Gate' of the house of Othman was secure from the assaults of the Tartars, and had not much to fear from the neighbouring dynasty of Constantinople. There, were collected, also, the great officers and chiefs, who had served it so zealously, who had witnessed its greatness, and hoped in its fortune, who were imbued with its spirit, and knew its traditions—the Grand Vizier, Black Halil's son,—Evrenos, the great chief of Macedonia, an old man of well nigh a hundred years, yet unabated in energy and keenness, who had, as a Christian, defended Brusa against Orchan, and had lived to accompany Bajazet, as a Moslem, to his ruin at Angora;—Michal-Ogli, the descendant of the first renegade companion of Othman;—the Aga of the Janissaries, the captain of the horse-guards, and the heads of the law; there, also, were the remains, or the reserves, of the Janissaries, and their schools; and to the prince who ruled at Adrianople, the Turkish feudatories of Europe looked up as to their master and liege-lord. There was the nucleus of the empire, and there, in fact, it was saved. But who the prince should be, who was to rule at Adrianople, was long uncertain. Strength and success are better tests than priority of birth, among the Ottomans, of the right of inheritance; and twice the veteran servants of the empire at Adrianople

[1] Instead of a signature or a seal, Timour, according to the Mongol usage, dipped his palm in red ink, and stamped it on the paper. See above, p. 270.

Digitized by Google

transferred their allegiance to a pretender, who gave the best promise of upholding the fortunes which they had founded with Orchan and Amurath. They deserted Soleiman, an indolent debauchee, for the more energetic Musa; in less than three years after, Evrenos and his companions called in, against the ferocity and oppression of Musa, the tried valour and wise humanity of the prince, who had reconquered a great part of his patrimony in Asia, Mahomet 'the Gentleman.'[1] Mahomet, says a Turkish historian, was the 'Noah who saved the ark of the State amid the deluge of the Tartars.'[2] But Mahomet himself had to maintain his right against another pretended, or perhaps real brother; and to the end of his life he was at war with the spirit of rebellion, which the great break-up of the empire had excited among its vassals, a spirit which he had to leave still unsubdued, to embarrass and keep back the ambition of his successor.

When Manuel Palæologus returned from the West to his capital, which he must have left with scarcely a hope of seeing it again, he found his position strangely altered, towards his dreaded neighbours. They, whom he had left thundering at his gates, had been humbled so low by their reverses, as to beg the help, and make sacrifices for the favour of a Greek emperor. Soleiman had given a son and daughter of Bajazet as hostages for peace, and offered to restore to Manuel the Turkish conquests on the Ægean and the Euxine, from the Strymon to Varna. In the wars of the succession, Manuel was able to throw in a considerable balance on the side he chose. To Manuel, Mahomet was indebted, at least, for the transport of his army to Europe; and when his victory over his brother Musa was secure, he confirmed the agreement of Soleiman, and yielded up to the Emperor the fortresses of Thessaly and of the two seas. 'Tell *my father*,' was the astonishing message of the grandson of Amurath, and the son of Bajazet,—the more astonishing as it was sent in good faith,—'Tell *my father*, the Greek Emperor, *that with his help I have won my paternal kingdom*, that I owe him thanks for this, that henceforth I shall be bound to him as a son to his father, and joyfully do him service.' That a prince of the blood of Othman should have professed to reverence the Cæsar of Constantinople as his father, was strange enough; it was strange that he should have condescended to pay an annual pension to Manuel, for keeping in close custody a pretender to the Ottoman throne; but it was still more strange, that, dying, he should have wished to shield his younger children from the jealousy of his successor, and *their* brother, by solemnly committing them

[1] '*Tchelebi*,' Mahomet's title, is thus translated by Von Hammer.
[2] Von Hammer, i. 281.

Digitized by Google

to the guardianship of the old enemy, the despised vassal, and long destined victim of his house.

And yet in those days of weakness and peril, when it was wise to adjourn their ambition, and amid the confusion of family quarrels and unceasing intestine war, it is most remarkable to observe in the Ottomans the traits of undamped energy and returning power. Their old dominion gradually stole again over the Ægean coasts, and then, with the exception of the Karamanian princes, over the rest of Asia Minor. Musa, during his short reign, was able to recover the boundaries which the Ottomans had possessed before Bajazet's fall, beyond the Morava, the Strymon, and the Balkan; and Mahomet, though disinclined to war in Europe, in order that he might secure the reduction of Asia, yet when he was forced into it, compelled the submission and tribute of Wallachia, and built the fortress of Giurgevo beyond the Danube, to overawe it. Venice thought it worth while to negotiate, for the first time, and even after Loredano's great victory at Gallipoli, to renew, an equal treaty with the Ottomans, during this period of their crippled power. The adorning of their capitals still went on. Soleiman began and Mahomet finished a magnificent mosque at Adrianople; at Brusa Mahomet finished another, equally famous for its grandeur, which had been begun by Amurath; while his own 'Green Mosque,' with its walls incrusted with variegated marbles, and its domes and minarets covered with green porcelain,—together with its adjoining school and almonry, and his own tomb in a garden, similarly faced with tablets of porcelain,—is spoken of as one of the rarest examples of Ottoman taste. It is less surprising, perhaps, that in those troubled days, should be found the earliest gleams, though they seem but faint ones, of Ottoman literature,—of their poetry, their history, and their law.

It is melancholy and humiliating, to contrast with the unshaken purpose and steady recovery of the Ottomans in the most trying crisis of their history, the aimless, low-minded, hopeless policy, without principle, without forethought, without honesty, without courage, of the Christians around them. What were they doing,—those Greeks who had all but seen Bajazet change St. Sophia into a mosque,—those Sclavonian races who were threatened with a bondage, which was to rob them of their children, and turn those children into their taskmasters,—those great powers of the West, whose faith and peace were menaced by a power, in whom the ancient fanaticism of the Saracens had revived in double strength, and whose life was war—what were they doing, during that unhoped-for and fleeting half century of respite and opportunity? All the world knew why the Ottomans were encamped at Adrianople, on the great road from the Bosphorus to the valley

Digitized by Google

of the Danube, looking at once eastward and westward, to Constantinople, and to Venice and Vienna. All the world knew why the Janissaries were instituted; and why the bands of Turkish spoilers beat all the countries, from the Euxine to the Adriatic, for the flower of their children, to feed the schools and recruit the ranks of that hateful company. And what were the Christians doing? They did not even stand by, to let their enemies struggle out of their reverses, as they might. They were making leagues with them, with those who remained of them still on the sacred soil of Europe: they were calling them in, to their own internal quarrels, or taking sides in theirs; they were fighting their battles for them, and aiding the stronger among them to put down the weaker; they were helping them to quell their own discords, and heal their own wounds, and build up once more the strength and unity of their State. But for the Cæsar Manuel, Mahomet could not have found shipping for his army, when he was uniting once more the divided courts of Adrianople and Brusa. But for the Genoese Adorno, Amurath II. could not have been ferried across into Europe to overcome the pretender Mustafa. Stephen of Servia took up the cause and retrieved the fortune, of the fiercest and most dangerous, against the most indolent, of the sons of Bajazet, when no Moslem power would back him; and Servians and Wallachs joined battle with Greeks under the very walls of Constantinople, to determine whether Musa or Soleiman should be the legitimate heir of Othman. Loredano conquered at Gallipoli, only to gain a commercial treaty. In the West, the Popes went on bargaining for a hollow union, extorted from the fears, but retracted again by the indignation of the Greeks: from time to time they faintly repeated the call of more earnest days for a holy war; but no one, in that shrewd and deeply-corrupted age, was moved by what all knew to be the mere cry of feeble selfishness, to dissolve an alliance, or stave off a threatening council. Sigismund of Hungary, the old antagonist of the Ottomans, kept up a border war, and achieved some partial successes, which did not wipe out the memory or repair the disaster of Nicopolis; but he was soon involved in the intrigues of the great schism, the home dangers of the Hussite war, and the anxious issues of the Councils of Constance and Basle. Neither the races whom the Ottomans enslaved, nor Christian Europe which is dishonoured by their presence within her limits, had any right to complain of the shame and the bondage. The final victory of the Ottomans was the fair victory, which resolution, patience, and foresight, will gain in any cause, over indolent or cowardly apathy, which will neither dare, nor endure, nor look forward.

Mahomet the Restorer died before his work was half done. He

Digitized by Google

died suddenly at Adrianople, when Amurath his eldest son was at the utmost verge of Asia Minor. Once more the succession of Othman's house, that delicate thread on which the life of the Ottoman state—vigorous and tenacious as it was—depended, was in danger. Amurath was summoned with the utmost speed; but the utmost speed could not bring him for many weeks. Mahomet's viziers concealed their master's death. For forty-one days the perilous secret was kept. The soldiers murmured and disbelieved. They insisted on seeing their Sultan. They would listen to no remonstrances of the physicians, and at fearful risk they were successfully cheated. In a closed and darkened kiosk—for the Sultan, it was said, could not bear the air—the corpse of Mahomet was presented to them, seated on his throne, behind a glass door; pages concealed beneath his vestments moved his arms; the soldiers defiling before the door, saluted what seemed the living form of their chief, and their misgivings were satisfied. But Amurath the Second had hardly been girded with the scymitar of Othman, before his right was challenged. Manuel, the Greek emperor, had a pretender in his keeping, who claimed to be the son of Bajazet. Amurath, in spite of his father's will, refused to give up his father's children, the blood of Othman, to the guardianship of a Greek Cæsar; and Manuel let loose the pretender Mustafa. The Ottomans were at once again divided. Mustafa was able to rally to him the sons of Evrenos and the feudal chiefs of Thrace. Beneath the walls of Adrianople, he boldly called on the Janissaries to yield him their allegiance, and his voice and presence were enough to win them over to his side; he was strong enough to insult the Greek emperor, who had been both his gaoler and his ally, and to cross into Asia, and threaten Brusa. There the tide turned against him: as his voice had lured the Janissaries of Adrianople to his side, so the call of their old chieftain Michalogli was known and obeyed in the camp of Mustafa's light horsemen. He was deserted, and escaped to Europe. But Amurath had no ships to follow him. He applied for aid to Manuel; Manuel refused his ships, except in return for the children of Mahomet. Mustafa might have reigned at Adrianople, and Amurath at Brusa, but for the traders of the factories of Genoa. Adorno, the son of a doge of Genoa, proffered his galleys and his soldiers. All was done, as between the heartiest and trustiest allies—by the Moslem Sultan and the Christian Podestà. The Italian's service was frank and faithful. The Ottoman's acknowledgments were large and princely. Amurath was accompanied by Adorno, with his archers and his black bands of Italian infantry, in his victorious march to Adrianople. Adorno gained for the trade of Genoa a new station on the Ionian coast, and the free

Digitized by Google

working of the alum mines of Phocæa; and enjoyed, unmolested, during his lifetime, the tolls and profits of its custom-house.

The spirit of revolt was not quelled by the destruction of Mustafa. The long reign of the second Amurath was troubled to the end, and his vigorous and able enterprises continually checked, by the restlessness and impatience which the defeat of Angora had awakened in the Turcoman chieftains of Asia Minor. The old families to whom Timour had once more opened a chance of independence, were very loth to surrender it again to their powerful yet now frequently divided conquerors. And the Ottomans, though strong enough to chastise and weigh them down, were a long time before they could, by successive efforts, extinguish, as they had done before, their revived power. They were often obliged, for the time, to be forbearing, even in victory. Three times did the restored chiefs of Karaman, the old rivals of the Ottomans, break their engagements, and stir up war. Their inveterate feud made them intrigue with Amurath's Christian enemies—with Manuel of Constantinople, and Sigismund of Hungary. Yet after each victory, Amurath was content with a tribute, or the cession of a city, with allying their princes to his family by marriage, or investing them with distant governments; he never pushed his advantage to extremity, and the rebellious house of Karaman was neither extirpated nor dispossessed. The Ottomans also began to employ against rebels whom it was difficult to attack, the smooth perfidy which their successors learnt so well to use. Thus was cut off the wily and able Djouneid, one of the most turbulent and dangerous chiefs of the Ionian coast, who had been the life of every civil war since Bajazet's defeat, and who had successively betrayed every pretender, whose cause he had directed and strengthened. Iurkedsch-Pasha set the precedent of that peculiar fashion of ensnaring an enemy, which is so familiar to all readers of Ottoman history. Four Turcoman brothers were the chiefs of a band of freebooters who infested Iurkedsch's government of Amasia. He sent to offer them, in the Sultan's name, a territory of their own, if they would give their assistance against another tribe. The offer was accepted, the treaty concluded, the chiefs complimented and honoured with presents, and the whole band, 400 men, enticed to partake of the Pasha's hospitality at Amasia. In the drunkenness and carelessness of a sumptuous banquet, they were overpowered and seized. They were thrown into a cavern in the rock of the citadel, the entrance was walled up, and all were stifled with smoke. The doer of this deed was the *Lala*, the tutor of Amurath, and after him, of his sons; and

Digitized by Google

the deed itself is recorded to his honour by the historian, who relates nothing but the worthy actions of his master's house. In this there is nothing to wonder at: the banquet was, from the times in which Idris wrote, the usual scene of the Ottoman's craftiest and deadliest revenge.[1]

Yet Amurath accomplished what his father had begun. At the end of his long reign, the Ottoman power, which was yet in danger at its commencement, was once more all that it had been, in greatness and security, on the eve of Angora. His reign began by Manuel of Constantinople dictating conditions of friendship, and setting up a creature of his own to invade Amurath's birthright. It ended by Amurath's choosing a vassal Cæsar among Manuel's children, and imposing the last emperor on the throne of Constantine.

The old preponderance of the Ottomans in all the countries between the Carpathians and the three seas, gradually rose clearer and more irresistible. Their frontier began to advance again, no more to recede for centuries. Beyond their frontier, the adjoining Christian states paid them tribute, and served them in their wars; and their armies began to appear with terrible power in those which still bade them defiance, and had hitherto been beyond their reach. Their western post on the Danube was pushed from Widdin to Semendra; and when they were obliged to retire from before Belgrade, Amurath said he could afford to wait, for Belgrade must be theirs sooner or later. Janina the southern, and Croia the northern capital of Albania, became Turkish cities. Janina offered its keys on condition of retaining its franchises; and in the demolition of its churches and the forced marriages of its daughters, experienced what Turkish faith was worth. The Lord of Croia, John Castriota, died when his four sons were hostages at Amurath's Porte; and Amurath, when he seized their heritage, compelled them to embrace his faith, and serve it with their swords. But the outrage and the perfidy raised up its avenger; and one of these forced converts has left his name to history, as the wiliest and fiercest foe the Ottomans ever encountered, the implacable and unconquered Scanderbeg. Later in his reign, Amurath wrested the Morea from the stoutest of the Palæologi, and restored it only, swept of 60,000 slaves, as a tributary fief of the Porte. Within the limits of the old Greek Empire, he fiercely warned off every intruder, even when he had not actually taken possession. John Palæologus, or the inhabitants themselves, had sold Thessalonica to the Venetians. Amurath claimed it of the Republic. 'It had been conquered by his 'grandfather Bajazet; it was part of the inheritance of his house;

[1] Von Hammer, i. 330. Idris died 1523.

Digitized by Google

'its possession by the Greeks and their Cæsars he might have 'overlooked—they were the natural tenants of the land, and its 'first masters—but no Latin would he allow to intercept his claim. 'The Venetians must go back to their own land: otherwise he 'would be there himself.' The embassies of the Republic were sent in vain; 'Have you authority to restore me my Salonik?'[1] was his first and only question. The Venetians kept their ground for a few years; but at length Amurath appeared with overpowering numbers before its walls. The Italian defenders were few; the Greek inhabitants disaffected; an earthquake spread discouragement and alarm. Amurath, while his arrows swept the ramparts and his miners dug beneath them, was liberal in his promises of pardon and protection; but when the Venetians still held out, he gave the spoil and the people of Thessalonica to his army, and only reserved to himself the ground on which it stood, and the bare walls of its buildings. Thessalonica was stormed and depopulated; the last of the many terrible calamities which had fallen on that great city—one, like Thebes, of the unlucky cities of history;[2] the first great siege in which the Ottomans, soon to become famous in this trying operation of war, assailed with success obstinately defended walls, and proved the fury and power of their storming columns.

The first great siege in which they had succeeded,—but not the first which they had attempted. Amurath had, early in his reign, replied to the slippery and ill-judged policy of Manuel, and to his insincere excuses when it failed, by saying that he would bring an answer in person to the gates of Constantinople. He came, through ravaged fields and wasted villages, where his soldiers had torn up the very roots of the vines and fruit-trees, and invested the land front of the city, from the sea to the head of the Golden Horn. The attack was the prelude and rehearsal of the great siege, thirty-one years later: the points assailed were the same; the siege-works and engines of the Ottomans were on a greater scale than any yet recorded in their history. They raised a continuous mound with fire-proof towers, facing, at a bow-shot's distance, and commanding with its missiles, the rampart of the city; they had all the ancient machinery of a siege; but they had not yet the new artillery of Mahomet the Conqueror. Amurath had promised Constantinople and its treasures to the conquering Moslems. Besides the soldiers of his host, there were collected round the Christian capital a rabble from all parts, lusting for plunder and blood,—armed ruffians to secure, and monied ruffians to purchase, the spoil,—such a crew as always collects in the East, when a rich and populous city is

[1] Daru, xiii. No. 7.

[2] Von Hammer, i. 336.

Digitized by Google

about to fall.[1] But foremost in ferocity and the madness of savage expectation and fanatic passion,—crying, howling, whirling, raging like wild beasts,—was an unclean rout of five hundred dervishes, who claimed the convents as their share of the prey, and kept at its height the excitement of the army. Their leader was the great Scheikh, Mahomet of Bochara, the Emir-Sultan, 'the chief among the princes' of Moslem holiness, the brother-in-law of Bajazet; who had girded Amurath with Othman's sword, and who had once before, it was believed, helped the true heir of Othman by his prayers. At the river of Ulubad, when Amurath and his rival Mustafa stood with their armies on the opposite banks, and the fortune of the empire hung in doubt between them, the great Sheikh of Bochara had prayed three days continuously for Amurath: at the end of the three days, the loud voice of Michalogli stirred their old allegiance in the hearts of Mustafa's *Akindjis*, and the rest of the usurper's host melted away from him. Now, the great Scheikh rode into the Ottoman camp amid a crowd of dervishes, who prostrated themselves before him, and kissed his hands, his feet, and the bridle of his mule. He shut himself up in his tent, to ascertain the fortunate day and hour when Constantinople was to fall. When he came forth, he announced that on Monday, the 24th August, one hour after midday, he would lead the Ottomans into their destined capital. A dervish with a wooden sabre had preceded the early Ottomans in their attacks on the Bithynian cities; so now, at the appointed moment, the great Scheikh mounted his horse at the head of the army; a huge buckler was borne before him; and surrounded by the crowd of yelling and frantic dervishes, he drew his scymitar and shouted forth the signal for assault. But Constantinople resisted stoutly and successfully. Manuel, the emperor, lay dying in his palace; but his son, John Palæologus, was at the post of danger—the fated gate of S. Romanus. *This* time, the Cæsar did not stand there in vain. Women armed themselves with reaping-hooks for swords, and the ends of barrels for bucklers; monks and priests were mingled with the fighting men, and shouted the sacred names of the Gospel in answer to the war-cry of the dervishes. The fury of the assailants broke in vain against the ramparts; it raged till the setting of the sun; then, says the Greek historian of the siege, it suddenly passed into a panic terror; the Holy Virgin had appeared on the battlements, in awful majesty, to the very eyes of the great Scheikh himself; and the whole Turkish host burned their engines and broke up from Constantinople. The Turkish power had not yet regained

[1] Cf. Gordon and Tricupi, on the siege of Tripolitza by the Greeks in 1821.

Digitized by Google

its strength, for the great effort: an outburst of civil war, and the appearance of a new pretender at Nicæa, recalled Amurath from his premature enterprise; and he never after attempted to renew it.

And indeed till the very end of Amurath's long and fortunate reign, that power, though mounting year by year to its old supremacy, was not safe from trials which jeoparded its existence. The last and decisive one,—the issue of which might have overthrown the Ottomans more hopelessly than they were overthrown at Angora, but which did in fact give the empire of the East finally into their hands,—was their great conflict with Hungary. During the earlier part of Amurath's reign, a desultory but bloody strife had raged on the border, in Transylvania and the Bannat: success had alternated, but Sigismund was an unlucky leader, and the wounds which the Turks inflicted were the deepest. Hungary was beginning to feel their system of preliminary ravage, by which each country, as they drew near its limits, was prepared for the condition of a tributary province, till they were able to occupy and parcel it out among themselves, into *sanjaks* and *timars*, the military fiefs by which the empire was maintained and carried forward. The cry of terror, 'The wolves, the wolves!' continually gave notice to the Hungarian villages that the dreaded turbans had been descried in their neighbourhood; and Hungarian boys and maidens, swept from under the walls of Kronstadt and Hermanstadt, were driven in such troops through the passes of the Carpathians, that a slave was bartered against a pair of boots in the Ottoman camp.[1] There were intervals of truce. The sessions and intrigues of the council of Basle were relieved, by the appearance of the envoys and magnificent presents of the Emperor of the Turks to the Emperor of the Romans: the embassy came to congratulate Sigismund on his election to the empire, and to offer a lasting peace; it was received by him with solemn pomp and honour in the cathedral, and the presents and the peace accepted. Yet Sigismund was at the same time corresponding with the Karamanian disturbers of the Ottoman power in Asia; and Amurath's pashas were soon leading the Christians of Servia and Wallachia, to join in a foray on their brethren of Transylvania. But towards the end of

[1] The historian Aschik-pachasade thus relates his own experience:—'Cette année (1438) le Sultan Mourad dévasta l'Hongrie. Le butin fut immense. Moi-même, le pauvre, j'achetai pour 100 aspres un beau garçon, car moi, le pauvre, je fis partie de l'armée. Un jour, je me présentai chez le Sultan, et il me fit don de plusieurs prisonniers; alors je lui dis: Seigneur et Sultan, il faudrait avoir des chevaux et de l'argent pour emmener ces prisonniers. Sur le champ il me fit donner deux chevaux et 5,000 aspres. J'arrivai donc à Adrinople avec quatre chevaux et neuf prisonniers. Je vendis ceux-ci pour 300 et 200 aspres la tête.'—Von Hammer; (trad. de Hellert,) notes: ii. 492.

Digitized by Google

Amurath's life, the raids and inroads on the Hungarian border gradually swelled into a serious and formidable war, which for once threatened the Turkish power with the combined and determined hostility of Christendom. John Hunyady, who is said to have owed his existence to a furtive amour of King Sigismund with a fair Hungarian lady, when he was seeking refuge from Bajazet's horsemen,[1]—a chief who in the irregular warfare of his country had no equal, except his contemporary Scanderbeg, fiery, audacious, crafty, and pitiless as the Ottomans whom he fought, and as open as they to corrupt and selfish influences, had made his name, in two or three years, a word of fear to those, before whom Europe trembled. The terrible and bloody '*Yanko*,' as the Turks called him, had slain one of Amurath's veteran chiefs, and captured a second; his soldiers had slaughtered his captives before him while he sat at meat, and he had sent to Buda a chariot, heaped with the choicest spoils, and surmounted with the heads of the fallen pashas. The warlike chiefs of Servia and Wallachia, who had so often fought for Amurath, went over to the winning Christian side; and a legate from Rome appeared in Hungary to fan the rising enthusiasm, and urge on the fierce valour of Hunyady. The rival councils of Basle and Florence, exhausted but not reconciled, had just ended their weary and fruitless sessions; and the crafty Venetian patrician, who sat in S. Peter's chair at Rome, seized the moment to turn men's thoughts from the thorny questions of internal reformation to a war with the Turks. Giuliano Cesarini, the cardinal who had so ably led the pertinacious and disrespectful fathers of Basle in their struggle with the Pope, and had already shown his zeal, if not his aptitude, in the conduct of a religious war against the Bohemian heretics, was despatched to employ his eloquence, his subtlety, and his turbulence, in rousing the wild nations of the Danube and the Vistula, in the name of the Holy Father. He succeeded. A little while before, Amurath could interfere in the internal affairs of Poland, and prescribe the conditions on which he was willing to support young Ladislaus on its throne. Now Ladislaus, king at once of Poland and Hungary, was the head of a confederacy, which included all the neighbouring Christian nations, Hungary, Poland, Servia, Wallachia, together with the Pope, the great maritime powers, Genoa, Venice, and Philip of Burgundy, and lastly, the Cæsar of Constantinople. A fleet of Italian and Flemish galleys, with the Pope's nephew, the Cardinal of Venice, as their admiral—such a post might not be wholly unsuitable to one who, though a churchman, was a Venetian nobleman—assembled at the Helles-

[1] Engel, in Von Hammer, i. 188. It is not the common account.

Digitized by Google

pont. John Hunyady, followed by the king and Cardinal Julian, burst like a tempest across the Danube. He beat the Turks out of Servia. He swept them before him, along that famous north-western road, the old pathway of armies on their march to decide the fate of nations, but which, for many years, had only seen them moving with unbroken uniformity against the west, and never in the reverse direction. Amurath stood under the walls of Nissa, only to be utterly overthrown. The Turks were pushed back to the mountain ramparts of the Balkan; half the great road to Constantinople, with its stations, was in the hands of the Christian army, and winter found them preparing to scale, amid snow and storm, the guarded defiles of the Balkan. Hunyady first tried the pass of Trajan's Gate, through which the direct road is carried; but he found it barricaded with rocks and paved with ice: he tried the next one to the east, the pass of Isladi, and on Christmas-eve, amid rolling rocks and descending avalanches, fought his way to the southern crests of Hæmus, and opened the road through Trajan's Gate to the army of Ladislaus. Once more the Turks were routed beyond the Balkan; and Hunyady, after slaughtering a hundred and seventy of his prisoners, led back a brother-in-law of Amurath, and the Beglerbeg, or military chief of Roumelia, to grace his triumph at Buda.

For the first time in their history, a sultan of the Ottomans sued for peace. It was not the time for peace: for Albania was rising against him under Scanderbeg; the Christian fleet was in the Hellespont; the Karamanian Turks were in league with the Christian powers, which had driven him across the Balkan; and while he was losing Europe, he was threatened in Asia. It was not the time for peace: but Ladislaus waited long for promised succours to renew the war, and they did not come; George Brankovich, lord of Servia, wanted to get his children out of the hands of Amurath, and to bargain with him for the future remission of all tribute and vassalage; it is alleged, that 50,000 Turkish ducats won the influence of the great Hunyady to the side of peace.[1] In spite of the earnest efforts of Cardinal Julian, peace was granted. The spring of 1444 was wasted, and in the summer, a truce of ten years, by which Amurath surrendered the tributes of Servia and Wallachia, but retained possession of Bulgaria, was solemnly agreed to. Copies of the treaty were made in both languages. Amurath swore to it on the Koran, and the Turks demanded that King Ladislaus should swear on the Sacred Host. This was refused; but he gave his oath to observe it on the Gospels.

[1] Contin. de Fleury, an. 1444. No. 2.

Digitized by Google

Such was the fruit of Hunyady's boasted 'Long Campaign.' Such was the use, which the Christian potentates of the Danube made, of the first great success they had ever won against the Ottomans. One of them got back his children; a couple of provinces were spared their tributes, till their mighty and inflexible enemy had gathered up his strength, in the breathing time which their princes had pledged to him; and for this ignoble and miserable bargain, the only moment when they had him at advantage was thrown away, the claims were neglected of their allies, who had gone with them into the war but were not included in the peace, and the hopes and the future of their brethren and their children, and of that Christian faith for which they had so pompously taken up arms, finally sacrificed. Well might Cardinal Julian indignantly protest against their selfish and short-sighted folly. Well might remonstrances from the Bosphorus and the Hellespont denounce their breach of faith with their confederates, and warn them of their madness, in dreaming that a treaty would keep back the Turks. A great opportunity—the greatest chance which the Christians had yet had against them—was lost. It would have been well, if this had been all; if the gross mistake of levity and greediness had not been followed by a great and memorable crime, deliberately committed under the auspices of the most venerable authority in Christendom.

Cardinal Julian had spoken like a statesman, wisely and manfully, *before* the oath by which King Ladislaus had confirmed the treaty. He spoke like a swindler and a knave *after* it. The word of a king, and the oath of a Christian, sworn, if not on the Holy Sacrament, at least on the Holy Gospels, were in his view no difficulties in attempting to undo what he had failed to prevent. It is likely enough that the light and wayward chiefs around him soon repented of their bargain. It is certain that the representative of the apostolic throne left no means untried to make them do so. But to their instincts, rude and fierce as they were, the oath was a barrier. Then did their chief spiritual guide, speaking in the name of the Great Pastor of Christians, and by the authority of Christ, undertake to allay their scruples. To these untaught barbarian children of rapine and war, the subtle and practised lawyer of Padua, who had come bringing them wisdom and benedictions from Rome, unfolded and explained the favourite thesis of that age of audacious hypocrisy and perfidy, that an oath is not binding, when high considerations of public good, and especially of the good of religion, are interfered with by its observance: and when the plausible diplomatist had confounded their sense of right and wrong, the Apostolic Legate, by the command and the divine powers of his

Digitized by Google

master, pronounced the oath invalid, and absolved all from its obligation. On the 15th of July, Ladislaus swore peace on the Gospels to Amurath. On the 4th of August, Cardinal Julian, the Legate of the Pope, made the king and his council swear again, in the name of the most Holy Trinity, of the most Glorious Virgin Mary, of S. Stephen and S. Ladislaus, that he would break his treaty with the Ottomans, and appear with an army before Orsova, on the 1st of September.[1] After such a deed, by such actors, it is hardly worth noticing, that some of them contrived that corruption and deceit should be added to perjury; but it *is* recorded that Hunyady, who is said to have been bought *for* the treaty by Amurath's gold, was bought for its violation by the promise of the kingdom of Bulgaria; and that, at his instance, the public declaration of war was delayed till the 1st of September, in order that the Ottomans might have restored the fortresses which they were to give up by the treaty, before they had warning that it was at an end.

Amurath had chosen that very moment for the first of his two abdications: whatever his reason, the step itself argued as much reliance on the oath of Ladislaus, as confidence in the general strength of the Ottoman state. But he at once re-assumed the government, and hurried back to Europe, when he heard that the Hungarians were assailing the fortresses of Bulgaria, on the Danube and the sea. How he crossed from Asia, is yet a question. The Hellespont was held by the Western galleys; the Bosphorus, it might be supposed, was commanded by the navy of the Golden Horn; and for neither were the war-ships of the Turks at that time a match. It is reported by one of the Hungarian historians, that ships of Genoa ferried the Turkish soldiers across the Bosphorus, and that the fare was a ducat a-head. However this was, Amurath crossed the Balkan, and with greatly superior numbers met the Christian host, encamped before Varna, with their left flank resting on the marshy lake of Devno, on ground which has since been made but too famous, by the losses of a Russian army in an obstinate siege, and of an English one in the idleness of a pestilential summer. On S. Martin's-eve, 1444, was fought this

[1] This is the transaction which is thus described in an eloquent review of the fortunes and probable destiny of the Turks: 'They, the allied Christian army, had considerable success against him (Amurath) at first; in vain was the bravery of Hunniades, and the preaching of S. John Capistran: the Turk *managed* to negotiate with them, *to put them in the wrong, to charge them with perjury;* then to beat them in the fatal field of Varna,' &c.—Lectures on the History of the Turks in their relation to Christianity. By the author of *Loss and Gain.* P. 180. This is a singular way of putting the facts. The Turk has much to answer for in the matter of perfidy; yet it seems rather hard, that he should also be made responsible for the treacherous counsels of a Roman Cardinal, and the deliberate jury of a Christian king, *against himself.*

Digitized by Google

great wager of battle. On high, between the two armies, and between earth and heaven, was exposed on a spear-point the treaty which Ladislaus had signed and sworn to: and in terrible words—words recorded by Christians and Ottomans—Amurath called on Him by whom it was sworn, to prove his truth by punishing the guilty. The wild and confused battle of the cavalry, the main arm on both sides, and the only one employed by the Christians, seemed at first to go heavily against the Ottomans. Even Amurath's courage and hope gave way; he was turning his horse out of the throng, when one of his pashas, more trustful than himself, seized his bridle and forced him to remain; but so near were the Hungarian sabres to his person, that one of them struck down an officer of the Janissaries, who attempted to release the Sultan's bridle from the hand of his daring subject. The horsemen of Hunyady and of Wallachia had borne down and swept before them, on the right wing and the left, the spahis of Thrace and of Anatolia; but the burning core of battle, was, as always, where amid the whirl and reflux of charging and rallying squadrons, the infantry of the Janissaries fought and stirred not. The Janissaries stood firm behind their ditch and palisades, and till they were broken, the field was not lost. Ladislaus dashed against them with the fiery youth of Hungary, and perished beneath their spears. He fell wounded: they refused him quarter: his head was raised aloft on a pike, and Hunyady fought in vain to wrest from them this signal of the Ottoman victory. That ghastly sight spoke to both armies in clear and dreadful emphasis the verdict of the day. The Wallachs and Servians fled and dispersed; and in the evening Hunyady himself escaped, and left the Hungarians to defend themselves as they could, behind the baggage waggons. Next day the camp was stormed, and they were massacred. Two bishops of Hungary fell, among the magnates and chiefs who perished with King Ladislaus;[1] and with them, perished the lying prophet, who had absolved them from their oath, Cardinal Julian.

The miserable fall, in the flower and pride of youth, of a king of Poland and Hungary; the death in battle of a cardinal and a legate of Rome, who had played such a leading part in the history of his day; and the swift and sudden stroke of retribution on violated faith, inflicted before the eyes of both Christian and Mahometan worlds, have made the field of Varna memorable,

[1] We are reminded of these days by the following extract from a newspaper of the day:—'A consistory was held at the Vatican on the 16th ult. for the purpose of conferring the scarlet hat on Cardinal Scitowski, Primate of Hungary. The Primate has greatly scandalised the pacific clergy of Rome by persisting in wearing a splendid dagger at his waist, "*ad defendendam crucem*," as he piously observes, his gold cross hanging immediately above the weapon.'

Digitized by Google

above more decisive battles. Varna, terrible as was its lesson, had not broken the Hungarian power, nor quelled the spirit of Hunyady. Which nation was to be mistress on the Danube, had still to be determined. It was determined four years after. In the summer of 1448, Hunyady led forth a numerous army, the finest and best equipped that Hungary had yet raised, with auxiliaries from Wallachia, and a band of German and Bohemian musqueteers, across the great river, and up the valley of the Morava. Servia was then leagued with the Moslems, and ravaged by the Christians. In the autumn, Amurath and Hunyady met again; their meeting was where Turks and Christians had met once before, under another Amurath, and a king of Servia, —the mountain plain of Kossova, the famous 'Ousel's field.' At Kossova, the natural trysting-place and battle-lists for the nations between the Adriatic and the Euxine, Scanderbeg, from Albania, was to have joined with Hunyady. But he did not come; the year was wearing on, and Hunyady attacked without him. On S. Luke's-eve, (17th Oct.) began a three days' battle; a harder one than even that, which, sixty years before, had made the highland brook, that wanders through the 'Ousel's field,' run red with Ottoman and Sclavonian blood. The cavalry skirmishes of the first day, the fierce and earnest conflicts of the second, between Hunyady's skilfully divided and successively relieved squadrons, and Amurath's huge and storming masses, left the victory still to win: the German musqueteers bravely kept the centre and key of the Christian line; the Janissaries, entrenched and immovable, were again the sure rallying-point of the Turks. A night-attack failed against their composed and steady courage. The morrow of S. Luke found the battle still raging which had begun on the eve, but found discouragement in the Christian ranks. By the evening, Amurath had won his last and greatest victory. Once more Christian warriors had sold their brethren; once more the first of Christian captains had deserted his soldiers in the hour of disaster, and left them behind him, to find their own way from the field, or be slaughtered on it. The Wallachians had been bought, and had gone over to Amurath. Hunyady, at the last, led his Germans and his artillery to stop the Janissaries; and, sheltered by the engagement, escaped, and escaped with difficulty, through hostile Servia. The second Kossova decided between the Ottomans and the Hungarians,—as the first had done between the Ottomans and the Sclavonians,—who were to advance, and who to yield. Hunyady's valour was henceforth reserved for the defence of his country. Scanderbeg, who, if he had been waited for, might have turned the scale at Kossova, continued to maintain his freedom fiercely among the

Digitized by Google

Illyrian precipices, and on his mountain eyrie of Croia;[1] but now the last struggle had been made, and henceforth the cause of Christendom was irretrievable, to the south of the Danube.

And the man who had carried through to its triumphant close this fateful conflict; who had won back for his house and race all that they had lost in Timour's victory; who had coped successfully with greater difficulties within, and more dangerous foes without, than his great conquering namesake, had, at forty years of age, become weary of his power, and longed for repose. A devotee in the view of Gibbon, a voluptuary in that of Von Hammer,—in reality, perhaps, both (for a life of easy and luxurious indulgence has often been no illegitimate accompaniment of Moslem devotion,) Amurath twice, with eager and hasty pertinacity, seized the occasion of apparent peace, to relinquish the throne of Othman and Bajazet to a son of only fourteen years. The first time was when the oath of the King of Hungary seemed to secure a ten years' truce with the only Christians whom he feared. He returned to conquer and to avenge. Then, from the bloody field of Varna, and the imperial state of Adrianople, he hastened away, the second time, to the unclouded Ionian skies, and the cypress groves and tulip gardens of Magnesia. With them, he reserved to himself the revenues of Ionia and Caria. Of his favourite pleasance, the fragment of a wall, and a few straggling cypresses, still remain. Near them—with the mosques and baths, the madhouse and the almonry, the school and the caravanserai, which are the motley monuments of another Amurath's luxury and devotion at Magnesia—is a mausoleum with more than twenty tombs—tombs of the youths and dames, it is said, who shared the retirement of the two sultans. But whether that of the conqueror of Varna was ascetic or voluptuous; whether he danced and howled with dervishes, or gave himself up to a soft and Epicurean ease, the Ottoman state soon needed again his experienced and vigorous hand. The first recorded mutiny of the Janissaries followed his abdication; the viziers of his son appeased it, and taught the soldiers their strength, by an increase of pay; and then earnestly intreated Amurath to return once more. A second time, within a year, he came back to the power, which he found that he could not abandon; and distaste or weariness did not abate the vigour and spirit with which he resumed the ambition and the policy of his race. His last years were at once his most glorious ones, and his most chequered. He overran the Morea: he conquered at Kossova: he gave its last Greek emperor to Con-

[1] See a sketch of Croia, in Lear's 'Albania,' p. 116.

Digitized by Google

stantinople. But he, who had broken the might of kingdoms, was baffled and humbled, to the very day of his death, in a petty and protracted mountain war. He made no more obstinate efforts anywhere, than he did to break or soften the spirit of Scanderbeg; he had never known such reverses, as dogged his armies through the stern passes of Albania, and before the crags on which were perched its robber fastnesses. The last scene of a long and fortunate reign was his repulse, sick and heart-broken, from before the walls of Croia, into which his gold could not buy an entrance, and which the huge stone bullets, launched for the first time from Turkish cannons, could not shatter; and the envied and dreaded Amurath went back to die by a fit of apoplexy, at a banquet at Adrianople.

With him ended the first series of the Ottoman kings; of those remarkable and persevering chiefs, who laid the foundations, and drew the plan, and prepared the power, of the Ottoman state. A little more than two years after Amurath's death, his son, a conqueror at twenty-three, rode through the broken wall to take possession of S. Sophia; so ready was everything left to his hand; so successfully had his father and grandfather laboured to repair the ruins and efface the stain of Angora. With Mahomet the Conqueror, a change comes over the character of the Ottoman state and its rulers. The possession of the centre of Eastern civilization, instead of softening and taming them, corrupted and debased them. They retained and exaggerated the vices of their fathers: they lost, what appear at least at this distance of time, their nobler and more hopeful qualities. For, fierce and remorseless conquerors as they were, men of passion and men of blood, the earlier sultans yet exhibit a far higher stamp, both of intellect and of character, than is to be found, with perhaps one exception, in the long line which followed the Conqueror. They planned, they ruled, they fought in person, and not by the mind and hand of slaves. There appears in them a power of self-control and self-constraint, of patience and forbearance, which disappeared when their children found themselves in the palace of the Cæsars; and merciless as their wars were, we do not read, except in the instance of the massacre of Nicopolis, of those monstrous and wanton slaughters of helpless crowds, which marked the victories of Timour, and even the *civil* administration of the Ottomans of Constantinople. When Amurath II. gave Thessalonica to the spoiler, he forbade and prevented massacre.[1] Two points may be particularly observed, in which the earlier are strikingly contrasted with the later sultans.

[1] Von Hammer, i. 351.

Digitized by Google

One is, the praise that is given to most of them, for justice and consideration to their Greek subjects, by the Greek historians who wrote at the very time when they were destroying the Greek empire. When all abatements that may be necessary are made, these reports yet show a feeling on the subject, which assuredly could seldom be found in later times. We are told of the strict impartiality of Othman's tribunal at Kara Hissar. We are told that under Orchan, the Greeks of Nicæa and Brusa preferred submitting to his rule, than passing over, as they might have done, to the dominions of the Christian Cæsar. Chalcocondylas compares the justice of the first Amurath to that of Cyrus, though the historian had suffered bitterly at his hands.[1] The united testimony of Ottomans and Byzantines bears witness to the humanity, the uprightness, the truthfulness and good faith, the gentleness, both to Greeks and Turks, of the first Mahomet. Ducas and Chalcocondylas both speak of the nobleness, justice, and equity, of the redoubtable conqueror of Varna;[2] and perhaps he was the last of the sultans whose word was generally given in sincerity, and could be trusted without imprudence. The other point is, their relations to their own ministers and servants. Every one who has looked into later Ottoman history, has been tormented by the confounding rapidity, with which the names of the great men of the state are changed, or rather, what adds to the perplexity, with which the changes are rung on a very confined list of names. With a very few exceptions, no grand vizier, no general or admiral, stays long enough on the scene for the reader to fix and master a distinct image of the man. In each case a slave has toiled up from the meanest condition, and often by the basest services: he appears, for a moment, on the pinnacle of power—for a moment, the absolute disposer of life and of welfare, in the mightiest despotism of the world: his master's hand waves, and the head rolls; or the slave drops, without a murmur or a memorial, into the nameless herd from which he rose. But the names are few, and recur continually and for long spaces of time, of those who helped and served the early sultans. Their prolonged and unbroken service speaks of honour and attachment on the part of the master, as much as of loyalty in the dependant. They were vassals and liegemen, not slaves. We do not find a single instance of capricious and sanguinary outbursts of displeasure against a great servant of the state, till the cruel and vindictive Mahomet the Conqueror. We hardly find till his day an instance of even a change or a disgrace. Great families grew up, and took root in the con-

[1] Von Hammer, i. 180.

[2] Idem, i. 351.

Digitized by Google

quered provinces, from whom the chiefs of the army were taken, like the children of Evrenos in Macedonia, or Timurtash in Anatolia. There was even a strong tendency to hereditary office,—in some cases, apparently, even by special privilege. Out of the first six viziers of the empire, one family, Black Halil's children, the Dchendereli, furnished four. The difference is perhaps made most palpable when we look at the lists, in Von Hammer's book, of the grand viziers and other great officers of the empire. In four centuries and a half, he enumerates 162 grand viziers; of these, the first six occupy more than the first of the centuries. The first six viziers served five sultans, till the reign of Mahomet the Conqueror. In the third year of his reign, the year of the taking of Constantinople, he put to death the vizier his father had left him, the namesake and descendant of Black Halil. In the thirty years of his reign, six grand viziers were deposed,—exactly as many as had served his five predecessors during a space of a hundred and thirty years. The seventh was slain by the Janissaries. And the changes were at least equally rapid under all the succeeding sultans.

Three times did Mahomet the Conqueror ascend the Ottoman throne. Twice he had resigned it, a sullen and reluctant boy of fourteen, whom it was necessary to inveigle out of the way, lest he should resist his father to his face, when, to save the state, he appeared to resume his abdicated power. The third time, seven years older, he sprang on the great prize with the eagerness and ferocity of a beast of prey. He never drew bridle from Magnesia, when he heard of his father's death, till on the second day he reached Gallipoli, on his way to Adrianople. To smother his infant brother in the bath was his first act of power; and then he turned, with all the force of his relentless and insatiate nature, to where the inheritor of what remained of the greatness of the Cæsars,—leisurely arranging marriages and embassies,—still detained from the Moslems the first city of the East;—little knowing the savage eye that was fixed upon him, little suspecting the nearness of a doom, which had so often threatened and had been so often averted.

For a hundred and fifty years the Ottomans had marked Constantinople for their own, and had waited. Long had been the waiting. Rapidly, and in hot and urgent haste, did the end arrive at last. All was at first peace and amity between the Ottoman and the Greek. The Greek even presumed to be the first to menace: the grand vizier, the friend of the Greeks, warned them of their madness in rousing the tiger before the time; but the words of Mahomet were still grave and courteous. The first year of his reign was almost over, and yet no signs were apparent to the Greeks of the fate which was drawing

Digitized by Google

near. But in the winter, the tidings came to Constantine, that the Ottomans purposed to build a castle on the European shore of the Bosphorus, at its narrowest interval, and corresponding to one already built in Asia: that the site had been chosen at five miles distance from Constantinople, and the materials collected. Constantine remonstrated, but vainly. 'No,' said the Ottoman, 'he meant nothing against Constan-'tinople;—but he should build on his own ground, for his own 'purposes; and the next messenger who dared to interfere 'should be flayed alive!' The announcement and the message revealed to Constantine the greatness of the crisis; but not to his people. He would have drawn the sword, but they refused. 'Amid hope and fear, the fears of the wise and the hopes of the credulous, the winter rolled away,' while Mahomet was burning his lime, and felling his timber, and quarrying his stone, to be ready for the first days of spring. Spring came, and with it his busy masons and zealous officers; and the summer saw the Bosphorus commanded by a new Turkish castle, bearing, in its fantastic outline,[1] an augury and a memorial of the man and the faith, which were henceforth to reign along those shores. Still Mahomet spoke not of conquest: but he pulled down churches to build his towers, and his soldiers turned their horses into the corn-fields under the walls of Constantinople, and slaughtered the peasants when they resisted. And he himself was eagerly and curiously questioning the cunning Hungarian engineer, whom the niggardness of the Greek arsenal had driven over to the Ottomans, about the powers of his art; and whether he could cast a cannon whose stroke should shatter the walls of Constantinople. 'Of Constantinople or of Baby-lon!' answered the craftsman. His cannon was cast; a Venetian galley, whose topsail was not lowered to Mahomet's castle, was sunk to try its range, and the survivors from the wreck impaled and beheaded, as an earnest of the purposes for which the cannon was destined, and the mind of its employer towards the Christians. Winter came on again,—the second winter. The foundry of the Hungarian engineer was kept in full work. The hugest cannon that had yet been imagined or cast, issued from his moulds, and Adrianople was terrified by its explosion when it was tested. As the time drew on, a fierce and savage impatience took possession of the terrible young man, who was preparing to seize what the greatest of his fathers had vainly longed for. He pried with feverish and dangerous suspicion into the thoughts and wishes of his

[1] The outline of the walls was made to imitate the Arabic letters of the name of *Mohammed*. The three Ms, a round character in Arabic, were represented by three towers at unequal distances.

Digitized by Google

soldiers and ministers. 'Give me Constantinople; that is all I require of thee,' was his ejaculation to his grand vizier, whom he had summoned in the restlessness of a sleepless night, to warn him not to be drawn away, as his father and his grandfather had been, by the bribes of the Greeks. So the winter passed with Mahomet, in anxious excitement, but in diligent and careful preparation. In Constantinople it passed, the last winter of the Christian empire, in dull and sluggish expectancy of evil,—deepened by the gloom of dismal prophecies, which were repeated more frequently and more confidently,—disturbed only by furious quarrels of which religion was the watchword,—enlightened by scarcely a gleam of hopefulness, of self-reliance, of purpose. The Emperor, in the maddening extremity of his helplessness, had consented once more to the submission, which the pride of the Popes was content to exact, from those who only gave it in distress, and never with sincerity. The Emperor had consented, but not the people of Constantinople. The Roman union was celebrated in S. Sophia, but cursed in the streets and convents of the city. Christmas, and Lent, and Easter, were spent in the bitterness of party war, in which one side avowed its preference for the Moslem turban over the cardinal's hat. And on the Friday after Easter, the Moslem appeared before the city, to take the boasters at their word, and to still the feuds of the two Churches in a common destruction.

Christendom was cold. The Pope, in spite of the submission of the Emperor, was offended and suspicious. In Constantinople itself, Constantine had made a muster of those who were willing and able to stand by him for their homes and churches. Out of that great city—the number has been preserved—they amounted to four thousand, nine hundred, and seventy-one! Those who defended Constantinople were not its own children, but foreign merchants and foreign adventurers. Out of the twelve posts of consequence around its walls, two only were held by Greeks; the other ten were commanded by Spanish, Italian, and German officers. To the last hour of the Greek empire, it was Christians who betrayed the cause of Christendom. While the flower of that mighty and enthusiastic host, which their determined and remorseless master had gathered round the walls, had been won from Christendom; 'while the greatest part of Mahomet's pashas and Janissaries 'were the offspring of Christian parents;' Christians, who had their faith and their liberty to save, hung back, and refused to fight in company. The Genoese traders of Galata were bargaining for themselves with Mahomet, in the very height and crisis of the siege; and looked on without molesting him, when

Digitized by Google

he dragged his barks under their fortifications, from the Bosphorus to the harbour. It was a Christian engineer who gave Mahomet his artillery;—but he was, perhaps, only a dull craftsman working for his bread;—it was a Christian ambassador in the camp of Mahomet, the ambassador of the great Hunyady, who instructed the awkward artillerymen how to breach the rampart.

It is some relief in this oppressive spectacle of blindness, of baseness, and of decay, to rest our eyes on the imperfect virtue and desolate end of the last Constantine. A brave man in a herd of cowards, yet even he did not deserve to save Constantinople; for he had sold his conscience and outraged his people, by purchasing the niggard aid of the Latins at the price of the humiliation of the Eastern Church. But he, at least, had taken his resolution to endure even to death, and that gave him nobleness. He calmly bore the insults of the fanatic and dastardly populace in the streets, who remembered only that he had suffered a Roman legate to profane by the Western ritual the altar of S. Sophia, and hooted him, while he was toiling against hope to save them. Then, when all was done; when, in spite of all, the Turks were in the harbour, and the walls had crumbled beneath their cannon; when the great breach was now ready at the gate of S. Romanus, and the last sun had set on an empire of eleven hundred years, he prepared to die, as one who bore the name and the crown of him who had been the first of Christian kings. All Christmas time, all Lent, all Eastertide, at Pentecost, on Ascension-day, there had been emptiness and solitude under the mighty dome of Justinian; since the Latin prelate had been there, the crowds of Greek worshippers had forsaken it, as delivered over to demons. Its midnight gloom was the fit refuge for a deserted emperor, when his soul came to seek for the last mournful moments of peace. All round the city, from the heights of Galata, along the bridge across the harbour, and in front of the city walls to the shore of the Propontis, a dazzling blaze of illumination lighted up the Turkish lines; in the camp, and on the sea, festive lamps were hung out on tent, and mast, and yard-arm, and the shouts of exulting multitudes, proclaiming the greatness of the false prophet, and the victory of the morrow, rose fierce and wild on all sides through the night, while the last rite that Christians were to perform in S. Sophia was celebrated, the midnight communion of its doomed emperor. Humbled and meek in his fortitude, he earnestly craved, as his last request, the forgiveness of those from whom he was parting. Dawn found him in the breach, breasting the destroying storm. He bore up while the Genoese captain, Giustiniani, who had fought with

Digitized by Google

him through the siege, remained by his side. He might, perhaps, have borne up successfully—but Giustiniani was at length wounded; whether from the agony of his wound, or, as others thought, from a despair which he could control no longer, the gallantest of the Italian captains left the breach; and when the stranger forsook him, Constantine sunk beneath his fate. He perished, unrecognised, by an unknown hand. A few hours afterwards, Mahomet rode through the gate, in which the heaps of corpses showed where the last fierce struggle for the perishing empire had taken place; and knew not that the Cæsar's was among them. It was found before evening; and, for the second time within ten years, the head of a Christian king was borne on a pike through the camp of the Ottomans.

The great capital city of the East had fallen, and both Greeks and Latins were alarmed, and mourned its fall. But it had changed owners before, and neither were at once alive to the full significance of *this* change, to the history of the world. Neither suspected, what strong and what cruel masters had come, to take possession of the desolate palaces, where the spider had long stretched her web,[1] and to fill once more, for centuries, their vast and echoing emptiness, with the crowds of a gorgeous court. Mahomet declared himself the protector of the Greeks of Constantinople. The new patriarch, he who had inveighed so fiercely against the Latin union and the compliances of Constantine, received his jewelled crozier from the hand of the infidel, according to the old ceremonial of the Byzantine court; paid him the same homage, received the same honours, as had accompanied the investiture of his predecessors under Christian emperors. But in time, the waste streets of Constantinople became peopled with new inhabitants from distant and strange regions. Where the venerable palace of Bucoleon had stood, the new Seraglio began to crown the promontory of the Golden Horn: the Mosque of the Conqueror rose on the ruins of the Church of the Holy Apostles, and the tombs of the Cæsars; and the Greeks were reminded, that in Constantinople they were in a capital which was not their own. And very soon too, the massacre of their noblest, and the dishonour of their fairest, told them more terribly what a change had come, in the place of the dull and oppressive, yet not sanguinary, Byzantine rule. Then they began to see what was meant by the settlement of the Ottomans at Constantinople; and Europe soon saw it too. The conquering fury of the Ottomans burst forth with new and consuming force, along all its old tracks; Austria and Hungary felt its desolations, renewed

[1] See the Persian verses repeated by Mahomet. Gibbon, viii. p. 256.

Digitized by Google

again and again, though it broke it in vain against the walls of Belgrade; it drove Scanderbeg from the haunts to which he clung so fiercely, to die before he could be conquered; in Europe, Albania, Bosnia, and Peloponnesus—in Asia, Karamania, and the Christian kingdom of Trebizond, sank finally under its strength. But this was not all. Lords of the Bosphorus, the Ottomans from this time, began to claim the seas, as they had subdued the lands. Mahomet was the first builder of an Ottoman fleet, and he lived to see its power. It gave him Negropont and the Archipelago; then it destroyed the settlement of the Genoese at Kaffa, and explored the Sea of Azoff, and the mouths of the Don, and the Danube; and from Kilia and Akerman, from the Crimea and Trebizond, the Ottomans were masters of the Black Sea. First of the European states, the Signory of Venice understood the great revolution in the East, and measured its danger. From the time of Mahomet II., no state recognised the importance of the Ottomans so clearly, or had such continual relations with them, both in peace and war, as Venice. Her keen-sighted envoys soon discovered how firmly the Ottoman power was fixed at Constantinople; how, under its remorseless and able chief, it was becoming consolidated and organized into a strong and enduring engine of conquest. Her own fierce wars and chequered negotiations with her new rival at once began, to last till both Venice and the Sultans were exhausted. And she had early and ample confirmation of her forebodings. In a few years, the Ottoman conquests had reached to the shores of her own Adriatic; their fleets had conquered Zante and Cephalonia, had crossed the Ionian Sea and sacked Otranto. And while the entrance of the jealously-guarded Gulf was bordered by a Turkish coast, and threatened by Turkish fleets, the Turkish horsemen had found their way, through Dalmatia and Friuli, across the rivers which pour into it at its head; and before the end of Mahomet's reign, the watch-fires and the burnings of the Ottoman ravagers had been descried from the steeples of the Lagunes.

The chronology of the Ottoman chiefs to Mahomet II. is as follows:—

Othman, 1288—1325.
Orchan, 1325—1359.
Amurath I., 1359—1389.
Bajazet, 1389—1403.
Mahomet I., 1413—1421.
Amurath II., 1421—1451.
Mahomet II., 1451—1481.

Othman, Orchan, and Amurath I. styled themselves *Emirs*. The title of *Sultan* is said to have been first taken by Bajazet; but Mahomet II. still called himself, also, the Great Emir. His style, in the capitulation of Galata, 1453, is—'Ο μέγας Αὐθέντης, καὶ μέγας Ἀμυρᾶς Σουλτάνος ὁ Μεχμὲτ Μπέης, κ.τ.λ. Von Hammer, (Hellert,) ii. 523.

Digitized by Google

ART. II.—*The many Mansions in the House of the Father, scripturally discussed, and practically considered. By* G. S. FABER, B. D., Master of Sherburn Hospital, &c.; *with a Prefatory Memoir of the Author. By* FRANCIS A. FABER, *Rector of Saunderton, Bucks.* London: Royston & Brown. 1854.

GEORGE STANLEY FABER belonged, in all his associations and habits, to an age of Anglican divines that is now passing away; and if we cannot wish for the resuscitation of his school, either in literature or theology, we can at any rate afford a sincere tribute to his indefatigable industry, his many amiable qualities, and the extent of his intellectual researches. He was of the class of dignitaries; though not in any unpleasant sense of the word; and, from the very commencement of his career, he was sufficiently in the way of promotion to have been relieved from any acute sense of neglected merit. Would that all his contemporaries, in possession of the Church's lucrative positions, had been equally deserving, and had equally devoted their dignified otium to study, and to the pursuit of truth! To wish they had all been equally voluminous in published writings, intended for the instruction of the public, would be an insincere act of regret, for we do not apprehend that, as a class, the result of their labours would have materially advanced the cause of theology, however useful they might have been to themselves in providing employment suitable to their calling. Mr. Faber, however, was a vast improvement on the worldly money-making dignitaries of his age. There were few of whom it could be said that they used their leisure for the benefit of literature and theology; that they were careful to fulfil such obligations as were connected with the offices they held, and that they made their house and income available for the general benefit of intellectual society.

The work before us was published by its author in 1851, professedly as the result of many years' thought, and in fact, as the expression of certain ideas, with reference to the future life of man, without which he felt in his own case that a Christian's hope would be wanting in tangible and real objects of anticipation. What those views were, we shall subsequently explain; whether or not they meet with any general sympathy on their own merits, it must be at least granted, that speculations on this subject come with peculiar interest from one, almost fourscore years old, whose whole manner of life, even from his

Digitized by Google

youth, had been calculated to promote serious thoughts of the future, and whose habit of mind had always led him to a very close dependence on the divine Word for his secret convictions. Grossly material, and even grotesque as some of his views may appear to be, they yet merit a degree of respect, as being the legacy of his old age, especially when it is remembered that they did not, by any means, owe their source to that age of life, when they were first published; but were conceived, in the full vigour of his intellectual progress, and were only indebted to the last years of the writer, for their expression in writing and for a confirmed testimony to their truth.

Faber was essentially a controversialist in religion. He felt more at home in this kind of writing than in any other. He was stimulated by the presence of an enemy, and his pen flourished with tenfold energy, when the vision of a hostile theologian was standing before his desk. Yet, withal, he was an amiable warrior, and all sense of honour in his cause was fully satisfied, if blood were drawn from the slightest scratch. He did not in his heart wish to inflict any deep or mortal wound. The pleasure of the combat was in his own adroitness, rather than in the enemies' discomforture; except, towards the latter end of his life, when the mysterious monsters of 'tractarianism' somewhat stirred up that genuine thirst for blood, which strong passions and real home-convictions are at all times liable to encourage. It is a blot on Mr. Faber's literary career that he disfigured it with the intemperate and vulgar vituperations to which we allude. Happily for their writer's reputation, they only survive in the miserable newspaper in which they were first published.

In the earlier part of his life, brought up as he had been with ultra-protestant associations, and possessed also of an instinct for literary combativeness, he as naturally fixed on popery for his object of attack; as in the case of other persons, we find that an unfortunate class of animals, such as foxes, bulls, or badgers, are brought forward into the arena of their combative propensities. As long as Dr. Trevern, Bishop of Strasburg, was his antagonist, he was delightfully in his element. The enemy was respectable, definite, and tangible: he was too distant to provoke any but legitimate personalities, and altogether he was that kind of foe, with whom it is most practicable to fight, and at the same time to feel perfectly cool. Their controversies did, indeed, at length exceed those polite rules of courtesy which Mr. Faber most anxiously studied at their commencement; but it was much after the same manner, and with the same spirit, that distinguish the rival annotations of angry old classic commentators, who were wont to thunder no

Digitized by Google

measured anathemas at each other, correctly expressed in the Latin tongue.

The following passage conveys what we may almost call a picturesque and somewhat amusing idea of this controversy:—

'Another kind of compliment was paid to the *Difficulties of Romanism* by the manner in which the Bishop of Strasburg received it. He had been treated with marked and studied courtesy by Mr. Faber; and some of the friends of the latter thought that he had carried the principles of Lord Chesterfield rather further than was desirable. Dr. Trevern's answer was in a very different strain. Though "a gentleman and a Frenchman," he forgot the politeness which is said to characterise his nation, and the loss of his temper proved that he was fighting a losing battle. His reply was soon greeted by a rejoinder from Long Newton, and in *this* publication Mr. Faber expressed his sense of the manner in which his courtesy had been received. "We have been wont," he says, "to esteem the well-polished sword the appropriate weapon of the gentleman; but the Bishop inclines to prefer the obtuseness of a bludgeon, or the deformity of the tomahawk." Mr. Husenbeth came to Dr. Trevern's rescue, and an amusing pamphlet from Mr. Faber's pen was the result of that gentleman's interference. Subsequently, Mr. H. published a work of some length, entitled "*Faberism exposed and refuted*," which fell still-born from the press, and was heard of no more.'—*Memoir*, pp. xviii. xix.

Though Mr. Faber had many prejudices, habits, and sentiments, which were characteristic of his contemporaries in our Church, yet on many points he displayed an undoubted originality of thought, as well as most noticeable peculiarities of language, and great freedom from intellectual bondage or the trammels of party. We suspect, indeed, that the work before us,—the publication of which gave him peculiar interest, as one with which he was anxious that his future name should be connected,—was so far antagonistic to the general views of his school in theology, that it was a kind of reaction against what he felt to be a narrow system; a supplement, though eccentric in its character, to fill up what had long appeared a void place in those theological schemes with which he had been associated. The manner in which this was accomplished, the peculiar theories, that is, which he propounded for the satisfaction of his own mind, partook, of course, of his own natural habits of thought, of his love for the positive and tangible, and so far must be received with no little caution; but yet, on the whole, we feel satisfied that, like the majority of errors, they sprang up from a real conviction of some existing defect in the sentiments and views that form the traditions of the day.

Thinking that our readers may take some interest in the very pleasant memoir of this theologian, supplied by his nephew, we propose, in the first place, to be biographical in our notice.

George Stanley Faber was the son of a Yorkshire clergyman, vicar of Calverley, and was born in 1773. His mother, whose

Digitized by Google

maiden name was Anne Traviss, was descended from Henri de Dibon, exiled on the revocation of the edict of Nantes; a Protestant confessor, from whom all his posterity seemed to have inherited strong religious feelings. A curious heirloom, possessed by the family, helped no doubt to maintain alive the fire of Protestantism, from generation to generation. Henri de Dibon, before he was hurried off by the dragoons of Louis XIV., buried his family Bible within a chest, in his garden. After many sufferings and tortures, such as 'the application of fire to wreaths of straw fastened round his legs'—this torture being resorted to because he was a sufferer from the gout—he at length escaped, and before he quitted his native land for ever, he exhumed the much cared-for treasure, with which he safely arrived in England during the reign of William III. The master of Sherburn, as representative of Henri de Dibon, came into possession of this Bible; and lest its history should be forgotten, or become the subject only of vague oral tradition, he wrote within it a most circumstantial account of its wanderings, together with a genealogy of the Faber family.

At an early age, George Stanley, that member of this family whom we are now considering, was sent to Hipperholme Grammar School, near Halifax, and when only fifteen, was matriculated at University College, Oxford, being elected to a scholarship the following year. The happy days of his undergraduateship were undisturbed by visions of coming strife in the battle-field of University honours; no feelings of ambition or jealousy were prematurely stirred up in the young academical mind, by the invidious and uncourteous practice of numbering men under the figures 1, 2, 3, and 4, in different departments of learning, like the A. I., &c. of metropolitan policemen. If a man was a good companion, and behaved like a gentleman, what more was needed? if he chose to be ignorant, that was his own concern and would be his own loss; for proficiency in scholarship always brought its own reward, and also made a man generally respected in society. How different now! Provided a good class can be obtained at the age of twenty-two, the whole object of literature is accomplished, and the thing too often laid by. On this subject, however, we are not speaking from any comprehensive view of its bearings, we only adduce the particular instance of Mr. Faber from the Memoir before us, as an instance of scholastic proficiency without the list of honours. Are there many candidates for deacon's orders in our days, who, like Mr. Faber, could ask with perfect simplicity of the examining chaplain, whether the answers were to be written in English or Latin? In 1793 he took his degree, and also was elected fellow of Lincoln, where he shortly became a tutor.

Digitized by Google

After an interval of eight years we find him, in 1801, being then only twenty-eight years of age, University proctor, sitting in judgment, by virtue of that office, on Heber's 'Carmen Seculare,' and also preaching the Bampton Lectures in his 'velvet sleeves.' It did not, however, accord with his tastes to remain in Oxford, or to follow up the academical success he had attained. It was one of his sayings, that 'a fellowship is 'an excellent breakfast, an indifferent dinner, and a most mi-'serable supper.' Acting on this long-conceived sentiment, as well probably as on softer and less philosophical impulses, he took the irretrievable step, in 1803, of vacating his fellowship by marrying, having not yet obtained any preferment. His choice is thus pleasantly described by his nephew:—

'The lady he married was Miss Eliza Sophia Scott Waring, second daughter of Major Scott, who took the name of Waring, well known as the friend of Warren Hastings. In this most excellent person he found a "help meet" for him, in the truest sense of the expression. Her own talents and acquirements were very considerable, and whilst she thoroughly appreciated the endowments of her husband, she was well fitted to be the companion of his domestic life. When he became a parish clergyman, the assistance which she gave him was invaluable; for her very active habits made her intimate with the surrounding poor, whilst her benevolent sympathies were ever ready to devise assistance for them. To a numerous acquaintance she was endeared by her social kindliness of character; but it was in the "inner circle" that her worth was best understood. Her thoughts were ever engaged on the welfare of others, and it might be safely recorded of her, that in no action of her life did she ever appear to consider herself. Self seemed like a subject totally forgotten by her.

'Words like these but feebly delineate the excellence of the person to whom they are applied, but it may perhaps be permitted to one who knew her well, to pay such an imperfect tribute of gratitude to her memory. "His saltem accumulem donis, et fungar inani munere."

'It pleased God to grant to this union a long period of duration, and the term of separation betwixt them was brief.'—*Ibid.* pp. xiv. xv.

For two years after his marriage he was content to live in his father's vicarage, acting as curate; at the end of that time Bishop Barrington presented him to the vicarage of Stockton-upon-Tees, in the county of Durham. This was a laborious charge, which necessitated great economy of time, in order to maintain inviolate a certain portion of each day for the seclusion of his study. We are not informed whether he was successful in the parochial art; whether, according to one phraseology, he was a good parish priest, or, according to another, his pulpit ministrations were acceptable to his congregation. His voice was indeed peculiarly mellow, and his reading was much thought of among his friends, but he would not seem to have possessed that rough power of lungs which is most suited to the wants of a populous north country parish. Little, however, is told us of this portion of his experience; probably it was rather

Digitized by Google

irksome to him, for his removal, in the beginning of 1809, to the rectory of Redmarshall, a rustic village with a small population, is pronounced to have been an acceptable change, as introducing him to a place certainly better adapted to a student like himself, than the larger sphere of action which he quitted. During his incumbency of this place he gave a striking proof, for the age in which he lived, of his honourable freedom from that grasping desire for accumulated Church patronage, which was the disgrace of his time. Bishop Barrington requested Lord Eldon to give him the adjoining benefice of Great Stainton, that he might hold the two livings together; the Chancellor readily consented, and the Bishop wrote to congratulate Mr. Faber on this addition to his income. The offer was, however, graciously declined, at the risk, as his friends thought, of offending his patron. In this, however, they were mistaken, for within a year the Bishop presented him to the rectory of Long Newton, which he held for the long time of twenty-one years, and from whence most of his literary productions emanated. That the act of refusing to be a pluralist was in those days considered a superhuman exercise of self-denial we have the following evidence, from one of much local acquaintance with the clergy:—

'When this anecdote was first told in the presence of the late Mr. Surtees, of Mainsforth, he rose, and with much gravity announced his intention of ordering his horse instantly. "Why," said a friend, in astonishment, "where can you be going at this time of night?" "Going?" said he; "why to take a look at a clergyman who has refused to hold two livings, to be sure." This joke was characteristic enough of the speaker; but Mr. Surtees did not forget the story when he published the History of Durham.'—*Ibid.* p. xvi.

This favourable opinion on the part of Mr Surtees, appears to have been maintained by Mr. Faber's subsequent reputation, judging from another passage in his history, to which allusion is made in the following extract. The memoirist has premised, quoting Wordsworth's beautiful lines—

> 'Where holy ground begins, unhallow'd ends,
> Is mark'd by no distinguishable sign,'

that at the rectory of Long Newton there was in former times no partition between the churchyard and the shrubbery:—

'An incumbent, long before Mr. Faber's time, had built a wall across the lawn; and this he did, as a parish record informs us, because the people of the village were accustomed to inspect the *facta* and listen to the *dicta* of the inmates of the Rectory. "The wall," Mr. Surtees goes on to say, "is now pulled down, and the cemetery and pleasure ground are again in one; but the *dicta* et *facta* of the present tenant of the manse need not shrink from audience or inspection."—*Ibid.* p. xvii.

An inspection indeed of Mr. Faber's proceedings would have entailed great watchfulness, for his daily labours commenced in

Digitized by Google

his study about six o'clock, and often before; his love of working must almost have amounted to a restless, nervous activity. He was the sole instructor of his two sons, and he was never assisted in his parish by a curate; yet his literary occupations were incessant, for besides his numerous publications, all needing much study, he maintained an extensive correspondence with many distinguished members of the learned world.

Thus tranquilly did Mr. Faber pursue that active and studious life which so well accorded with his tastes, till 1830, when at last he became a dignitary. Bishop Burgess gave him a prebendal stall in Salisbury Cathedral; and in 1832 he received, from Bishop Van Mildert, a still more important piece of preferment, that of Sherburn Hospital; at which place he resided for the remainder of his life. His nephew thus speaks of this change in his fortunes:—

'To a man of his pursuits and habits nothing could be better adapted; for, by giving him complete command over his own time, it enabled him, without any scruple of conscience, to devote himself as much as he pleased to the labours of the closet. It was, in short, one of those sanctuaries, which the piety of olden times provided as a retreat for the learned and the good; and which the spirit of modern progress, as it is called, would gladly sweep away. To Mr. Faber it was even more than this, for it was given him as a reward for the services of many years. It was his "patent of nobility," by which he showed to his clerical brethren that he had "approved himself in the office to which he had been called." There were other circumstances, too, which tended to increase the pleasure of his residence at this place: it is in the immediate neighbourhood of Durham, and amongst the clergy of the Cathedral and the University he had many valued friends. If ever an affirmative answer to the old question, *An locus conveniat locato?* could be given, it might surely have been given here.'—*Ibid.* p. xxxi.

Sherburn Hospital was originally founded, for the exclusive accommodation of lepers, by Bishop Pudsey, in the twelfth century; but in the time of Queen Elizabeth it was devoted to the maintenance of thirty brethren, natives of the Diocese of Durham, only half of whom reside within the walls of the Hospital. The institution also possessed a chaplain, so that no very onerous labours can have fallen on the master. At the present moment the foundation is in abeyance, waiting the ungentle verdict of a ruthless Charity commission. In former times the situation of the Hospital was that of 'pleasant pastoral seclusion,' cheered by the bells of Durham Cathedral. Its character, however, is much altered by the substitution of coal-pits for sheep-folds, and of tall, gaunt, slate-coloured men issuing forth from the nether regions of earth, and stumping along on its surface with large wooden clogs, in place of those pretty Arcadian figures, which shepherds, of all times and countries, are supposed more or less to resemble. These external invasions, however, of the picturesque were compensated for, by

Digitized by Google

the erection, on Mr. Faber's appointment, of a far more commodious house, than Dr. Bell, of educational notoriety, his immediate predecessor, had enjoyed. The Hospital, under Mr. Faber's reign, is thus described:—

'To the spacious and convenient mansion which arose upon the ruins of the ancient dwelling Mr. Faber finally removed, in the summer of 1834, and here he constantly resided during the remainder of his life; still following the avocations of a student, but entering freely into the hospitalities of the neighbourhood, though he was at all times better inclined to see his friends at home, than to quit his own fireside. His partner, too, loved well to fill her house with her friends, and delightfully she played the part of hostess; infusing into everything that she undertook, a spirit of vivacity and cheerfulness which was certain to be reflected back from others, and throwing over all, the exquisite charm which arises from genuine benevolence of heart. With such a mistress, it is not to be wondered at that both young and old found Sherburn House a favourite place of resort. It was seldom without company, the guests being not unfrequently persons of literary celebrity; and the residence of the Superior *mutatis mutandis*, promised to be as renowned a "Xenodochium" as the Hospital over which he presided.'—*Ibid.* p. xxxii.

One great charm of Mr. Faber's society consisted in his store of anecdotes, with which he was ever willing to entertain his guests. The present generation are not much given to that style of conversation which is understood by the expression, 'full of anecdote.' We are very intolerant of being *bored* with long stories; and impatient of any prolonged attention being exacted by the discourse of one individual. We all want to join, and therefore promote the short repartee style of conversation, in preference to the steady listening, which our forefathers were content to sit under, so long as they had good cheer before them, and a spokesman of creditable powers. We do not question the general improvement which has, within the last generation, come over the intercourse of intelligent people; no doubt there is more acuteness and readiness in the tone of ordinary conversation, more diffused information, and a more equal distribution of sensible talk, than in society fifty years ago; but this very improvement in the mass, is at the sacrifice of great individual talkers, whose pleasant rehearsals used, no doubt, to afford great satisfaction to many listeners. A little egotism, and the entire occupation of a whole company by one speaker, used to be willingly endured, if that speaker was pronounced deserving of attention; and therefore, the art of telling stories or anecdotes was studiously fostered by any one who had a gift that way; whereas, in these days, the necessity of compression, and of rapidity in the details of any communication which passes in general society, and the fear of being prosy, act as a discouragement to any rising ambition at assuming the character of a man 'full of anecdote.' In the

Digitized by Google

case of young men, we are stringently severe on the slightest attempt to subjugate our listening powers, or to claim any large share of mental attention; but with those who have derived their habits from a former generation—who enjoy the privilege of age—we are still tolerant, partly no doubt from the respect which they claim from us, but also from the fact that they can tell stories and anecdotes more neatly and pleasantly, with more point and facility of expression, than we are accustomed to meet with in juniors. Mr. Faber would seem to have enjoyed this art, and to have had great pleasure in the exercise of it: from him a decided lead in the conversation would come as a natural right, and be acceptable to all who were enjoying the hospitality of the Hospital. The following picture is suggestive and interesting:—

'In these pleasant reunions, which many will remember now with sorrowful pleasure, the master played his part well in the entertainment of the inmates; and a stranger might have been surprised to notice that a scholar like himself could "touch life at so many points." His conversation, like his reading, was various and discursive, full of entertainment and instruction, and he had a rich store of racy anecdotes, always borrowing much of their effect from the manner of the narrator. This was especially the case when his stories were descriptive of provincial life and manners, for he kept up to the last his familiarity with his native dialect of Yorkshire. There were indeed few topics upon which he did not know something, so miscellaneous had been the nature of his reading, whenever abstruser studies were laid aside. He used to call himself a perfect *helluo librorum*; and it may amuse the reader to hear that he applied this epithet when detected in engaging in what he called "a course of Mrs. Radcliffe's romances." '—*Ibid.* p. xxxiii.

Cards the Master of Sherburn abjured, partly on principle, but chiefly, his nephew rather implies, because they interfered with conversation, that 'divine talk,' which he rightly held ought to be the staple amusement of intelligent beings. In order to maintain his conversational powers, he was a great devourer of all contemporaneous literature, especially romances; although, at the same time, he was so unwilling to forget anything which had ever formed part of his mental store, that a friend, one day, found him sedulously reading the whole of the plays of Euripides: on which occasion he quietly replied to some expression of astonishment, 'It is true that I shall want these things no more, 'for my boys are done with; but it is always unpleasant to 'diminish any faculty which one once possessed; and as I am 'a tolerably good Grecian *now*, I should like to continue so.' One of his special literary tastes was for the supernatural romance of the East. Arabian Magic or Hindoo Mythology were his delight. Oriental lore and tales of enchantment, as 'Thalaba,' and 'Kehama,' were most favourite studies. The history of the appearance of Samuel to the witch of Endor, is dwelt on at great length in the course of the book now before

Digitized by Google

us; while mysterious prophecies and visions, occurring in Scriptures, are everywhere shown to have been his favourite objects of investigation. This hardly arose from his love of mystery, as such; but rather from the pleasure of exercising his ingenuity in unravelling the mysterious element before him, and displaying to view a plain tangible result or fact. Real and acute appreciation of character as drawn by the humourist, or the depicter of common life, does not seem to have engaged his interest to that extent which we associate with the mind of a deep observer of mankind. In truth, Mr. Faber was so actively engaged in a never-ceasing round of self-occupation, that he never enjoyed those periods of reflective contemplation, which may perhaps seem at the time to be only the indulgence of an indolent mind, but which are yet productive, in some persons, of much thought and deep-seated knowledge of practical life. It was symptomatic of Mr. Faber's turn of mind, that he much preferred the romance of Southey, to the humour and the descriptive powers of Sir Walter Scott. This last author he seems wholly to have failed in appreciating. Again, of the plays of Shakspeare, he preferred the Tempest and Midsummer Night's Dream, to those which contain a more solid study of character. He abhorred Byron, except Manfred; and delighted much in Bulwer's 'King Arthur.' This love of the imaginative, is stated by his nephew not to have applied to theological writers, but to have been changed in their case into a liking for a more homely style. Jeremy Taylor he was not fond of, and professed to be wearied by his exuberance of imagery; indeed, strange to say, he did not possess a copy of his works. Hooker he ranked preeminently first of English divines, and Barrow next; but the Anglican Chrysostom he placed nowhere. We are not disposed to quarrel with any one's right to assert an individual taste in this matter: much as we admire Jeremy Taylor, it is undoubtedly the case, that style sometimes carries him away into a stream of volubility which, interspersed as it is with most terrible formations of Anglo-latin phraseology, may be allowed to have its wearisome feature. Yet in spite of this we feel that not to admire Jeremy Taylor suggests the suspicion of a certain deficiency in appreciating poetical language, and especially in a person whose own style is somewhat remarkable for abrupt and broken statements, and for the want of that flow and rhythm which prose may possess as well as verse. The framework of Mr. Faber's writing is generally somewhat exposed, and his compositions are therefore open to a charge of dryness, which is not perhaps deserved when the matter and thought, used in their cause, are recognised. His syllogisms and logical machinery of a sentence, together with

Digitized by Google

a free use of emphatic symbols which encroach on the art of the typographer, rather than display the man of letters in a higher sense of the expression, all betoken a want of richness and grace of style. In fact, we suspect he had no real flow of language, but rather that he possessed an art of dotting down on paper, with considerable energy and acuteness, certain arguments and suppositions, whose sequence and consistency depended often on a violent external arrangement of parts, rather than on any internal gift of eloquence.

Yet if we thus criticise Mr. Faber's usual style of writing we must admit occasional exceptions, and are bound to redeem his habit and taste of mind from any want of refinement, or of poetry, by recording in the following extract his great love of music:—

'Another great resource was music, which he enjoyed most thoroughly, and of which he had a considerable scientific knowledge. In the Lyra Ecclesiastica, published by the Rev. J. Fawcett, of Wibsey, Yorkshire, there are three of his compositions; the last of which, entitled "Salvam fac Reginam," is very beautiful. Few things, indeed, were more to his mind than the society of guests distinguished for their musical talents. Upon such occasions all discussions ceased, and nothing was allowed to interfere with the claims of Euterpe. The writer well remembers, when on a visit with him at the house of a common friend, how zealously he laboured to initiate two young ladies of the party into the mysteries of thorough bass, and how interesting he made it to his pupils. In the society of his young female friends, especially if they showed any tendency towards intellectual pursuits, he always took especial pleasure: and there is perhaps no passage in his life more pleasing than that which is exhibited in his prefaces to the poems of his much-loved niece, Sophia Woodrooffe, a young lady of rare promise, to whom, when cut off in the very opening of her blossom, her parents might well have applied the motto which distinguishes the remains of Arthur Hallam—

'Vattene in pace, alma beata e bella.'—*Ibid.* p. xxxvi.

In memory of this youthful poetess, an extract from her 'Five Garlands,' is mentioned in our Memoir, as deriving special interest from the connexion between the Hospital of Sherburn and her own personal history. The peculiarities of the locality form the obvious scene of this poem, while its conclusion assumes almost a prophetic character, when we hear that she was numbered with the dead a very short time after:—

'Fair forms, and robes of radiant white
With wreaths of orange gleaming bright
Floated before the dazzled sight.
But quickly did that vision wane.
Another comes—a stately fane
With solemn portal, and a train
Of youthful figures gliding slow,
In sable veil'd, and chanting low.'—*Ibid.* p. xlviii.

In the year 1844 Mr. Faber's health, which hitherto had been uniformly good, was materially affected by an obstinate cutaneous disorder. From this he himself recovered, but the care

Digitized by Google

and anxiety of his illness entirely shattered the health of Mrs. Faber, who gradually declined in strength, though even to the last she persevered in works of charity which were far above her powers. In 1851, however, Mr. Faber became a widower, and the short interval which remained in his own life is thus told:—

'Those who were acquainted with Mr. Faber's habits of life could not view his bereaved condition without much anxiety, knowing how he had been accustomed to entrust everything to his helpmate. But it was ordered that his loss should be repaired, so far as reparation was possible. Amongst the literary or scientific friends, whom his repute as a man of letters procured for him, was Miss Louisa Beaufort, an Irish lady, whose acquirements rendered her a very acceptable correspondent to a man of learning. She had presented the Master with a copy of her work on the Round Towers of Ireland, being at that time unknown to him; but in this circumstance originated the friendship with herself as well as with her brother, Sir Francis, Hydrographer to the Admiralty. Upon the occasion of one of this lady's visits, she was accompanied by her niece, Miss Marian Beaufort, who was soon on terms of affectionate intimacy with the family at Sherburn, and who was indeed a distant relative of Mrs. Faber. This young lady chanced to be still in the neighbourhood, when the approaching winter of 1851 rendered it necessary for the Master's daughter-in-law to seek a warmer part of the Island. She had observed with much pain her mother's fast increasing debility, and requested Miss Beaufort to spend some little time at Sherburn after her own departure, in order that Mrs. Faber might have a female companion constantly at hand. The latter only survived till the end of November; but Miss Beaufort's intended temporary visit was changed into a permanent residence, for she most kindly consented to preside over the Master's establishment: an arrangement the more valuable to him, as the delicacy of Mrs. William Faber's health rendered her unable to endure a northern winter. Nothing could have been more gratifying to Mr. Faber than such a prospect, and never did result answer more completely to expectation. He was accustomed to call Miss Beaufort his adopted daughter, and, indeed, he could scarcely have regarded her with more affection had she really been his own child. During the short period which still remained of his pilgrimage, her society formed his principal comfort: she became completely identified with the family, shared the last watchings with them, and was one of those who had the privilege to stand by his death-bed. Her labour of love at Sherburn came to an end sooner than might have been anticipated, but none of Mr. Faber's family can ever forget what he owed to this lady's kindness, or sufficiently express the gratitude with which they must always remember her name.'—*Ibid.* pp. l. li.

In November of the year 1853, Mr. Faber had a serious bronchial attack, which was followed by a spasmodic affection of his heart. His end was now close at hand, which is thus most simply yet touchingly described by his nephew:—

'For some days previous to the Master's departure there had been recurring attacks of his malady, very distressing to witness, and on the evening before he died he sustained one of an unusually severe character: but it was the last, and the remaining hours of his existence were free from pain. At nine o'clock on the night in question, he expressed a wish to meet his family and household in prayer for the last time. For this purpose all his domestics assembled in his chamber, together with his son and daughter, his great-niece, Miss Eleanor Faber, Miss M. Beaufort, Mr. Hepple, and Mr. and Mrs. Prest. The chaplain offered up the usual petitions,

Digitized by Google

and in the Lord's Prayer, at the close, the voice of the dying man was at times distinctly audible. "When we rose from our knees," says one of those who were present, "he said, 'God bless you all; I have not breath to say much, but I wish you all good, most truly, most sincerely.' A never to be forgotten sight it was, to see that venerable old man, with his grey hairs, sitting so peacefully whilst his spirit was passing away." He had spoken to Mr. Prest previously of the great change which was approaching, when he said, "that if he looked to *himself*, he felt fear; but when he turned, as he could do, to Christ, all was hope." During the continuance of one of the paroxysms he whispered, "God is very good to me." And Miss Beaufort writes, "Never can I forget the emphatic manner in which he said, in that last fit of great suffering and oppression before his death, as I was wiping the damp dew from his forehead, 'Great bodily suffering, but perfect peace within.'" His mind, at one time, had probably been dwelling on those mysterious scenes which, in his last work, he had endeavoured to unfold; for he said on the last day of his life, "I am going, to be happier, and where all mystery will be taken away." The same lady adds, "I never saw anything so calmly, trustfully peaceful as he was. There was no enthusiasm, no exaggerated warmth of expression, but a perfect, quiet assurance of his own salvation and approaching happiness through the merits of his Saviour. Often and often during those last few days, he said, 'If I thought of myself, I should be wretched; but I look away from myself, and on to Christ: for well nigh sixty years he has led me in the footsteps of his flock, and I know He will not now forsake me.'" A similar sentiment he uttered, with much solemnity, to his younger son: "I desire," he said, "to bear my testimony, that I place my sole hope of salvation on the alone merits of Jesus Christ." At ten o'clock on the morning of the 27th of January, 1854, he entered into his eternal rest.'—*Ibid.* pp. lv. lvi.

Thus died, in the 81st year of his age, a worthy man; whose distinguishing quality is stated by his nephew, in no light words of praise, yet well deserved by him, to have been 'plain sincerity of speech, and downright honesty of purpose.' The open frankness and independence of his biographer, disarm all personal criticisms. By temperament Mr. Faber was nervous and slightly irritable, which often conveyed to strangers a wrong idea of his character. Though by nature apprehensive and anxious about the future in secular matters, he was yet uniformly liberal in all pecuniary transactions; and it is much to his credit that he increased the stipends of the poorer livings, which were in his gift, as Master of Sherburn.

Mr. Faber's literary productions, exclusive of pamphlets, are twenty-six in number. It was always in controversy that he became most voluminous, and a friend suggested to him on one occasion, that he felt it a subject of regret for his time and energies to be so much devoted to controversies, which in the nature of the case could not be of lasting interest. In reply, he intimated a doubt whether he should have been so successful or so useful in any other line. On being then reminded of his treatise on the operations of the Holy Spirit, he answered half smiling, 'True; but the composition of that little work gave

Digitized by Google

me more trouble than any two of my longer ones.' Perhaps it would have been better if, by a little self-restraint, Mr. Faber had devoted himself more than he did to the writing of uncontroversial books, even at the risk of not leaving behind him so great a number of volumes. The book just instanced as being an exception to his general taste, has passed through many editions, and has established a position far in advance of his other writings. The nature of the controversies in which he was engaged, is indeed little calculated to give them any lasting interest: they were not undertaken from any practical idea of aiding his Church in developing and bringing to the surface, by her own struggles and her own divine power, the great mission entrusted to her. Mr. Faber was too fond of mystic speculations, to devote much time or thought to the daily work of the Church immediately around him. His ingenuity and labour were expended in crushing foreign theories and errors, while he too much overlooked the urgent need of his own Church to be raised up, by powerful constructive efforts, for the great home work that was before her. All, however, have their tastes and vocations, nor do we quarrel with Mr. Faber for pursuing that line of study, which he felt most congenial with his powers; but the fact that he was, by his own choice, much removed from the practical business of the Church, must essentially weaken his authority on some questions of the day, about which, in the latter part of his life, he expressed very strong opinions.

On many points we have to regret that Mr. Faber's influence was exerted with considerable energy to the hindrance of the Church's true interests. The boldness and independence for which he was always noted were brought to bear in their fullest development against what he denominated *Tractarianism*. This indeed was, according to the acknowledgment of his biographer, who admits it with evident regret, the characteristic of his declining years. Circumstances in his own family connexion were indeed naturally calculated to inflame his mind against what seemed to him the prevailing spirit of modern Oxford; and it was no doubt deeply mortifying and wounding to him, that a favourite nephew should actually join that Church against which it had been the mission of his whole life to hurl unceasing thunderbolts. But such is all human controversy; it is no uncommon thing for a long series of imagined victories to be all at once succeeded by some partial but irritating advantage on the part of the enemy whom we had with too much self-complacency thought to be utterly conquered. Mr. Faber's retaliation was, however, too wholesale: brilliant as were some of the present converts of Rome when pursuing their respective academical careers in Oxford, they were not the whole of Oxford, and the

Digitized by Google

number who yet remain within her walls, actively and faithfully engaged in serving the cause of their mother Church, will bear comparison with any former age of her history, in spite of all deserters. Mr. Faber's grievous complaints of Oxford arose, indeed, from the querulousness of an irritable temper on seeing the progress of events outreaching his own ideas. Yet we cannot be angry with him, for he was always honest and independent, even at the price of consistency, of which no greater proof can be given than many eccentric statements and sentiments in the book before us, which do not claim their origin from any general principles of the school he so warmly supported. We excuse him for saying, at eighty years of age, that he had only been regenerated sixty of that number; though doubtless the Vicar of Calverley duly brought him to the font of his parish church long before he could freely select his own religious course; we overlook this, because the present book is the best illustration of the extravagant results that may follow from such erroneous ideas, and such a loose way of talking.

After the space we have devoted to the biographical portion of the book before us, we cannot dwell on the work itself; nor, as a whole, do we consider that it is worthy of any lengthened review. It was a sentiment of Dr. Johnson's, that if an author has any special affection for one part of his writings more than another, it will probably be to his future credit that he should immediately destroy his pet child. We are not sure that an illustration of this sentiment is not afforded by Mr. Faber's 'Many Mansions in the House of the Father.' That it was a pet child is clearly shown in the following extract from the Memoir:—

'This work, as has been remarked, appeared in 1851, and Mr. Faber lived to see the issue exhausted. The edition to which this memoir is prefixed, was called for in the last year of his life, and an interesting note which is here subjoined, was written by the author to the publishers, on hearing of it.

' "Dear Sirs, ' "Sherburn House, Feb. 7, 1853.

' "I have to thank you for your very satisfactory letter. . . .

' "They say that an author is not the best judge of his own works: and peradventure, I might have a sort of special affection for my *Many Mansions*, as the child of my old age. But I am much inclined to rate it higher than any of my former writings. In it, except occasionally in new editions, I take my leave of the public: for a man, who is rapidly approaching to eighty, may well think it time to bring his labours to an end.

' "I shall certainly be very glad to hear of another edition: and all the rather because I do not recollect that the former requires either correction or alteration, which is more than I can say of most of my former works. .

' "Believe me

' "Yours truly,

' "G. S. Faber.

' "To Messrs. Royston & Brown." '—*Ibid.* p. lii.

Digitized by Google

A reference to some passages in this favourite work—which was so perfect that it required neither correction nor alteration—will, we think, in the opinion of our readers, complete the lexicographer's inference. But even if we had formed the design of noticing, as a second part of our article, the substance of this work, we should despair of our task. Amid the multiplicity of sciences, of localities, of times, of living and inanimate existences, of things known and unknown, past and future, natural and revealed, we lose that fixedness of mind and that comprehension of a main idea which are pleasant, if not necessary, in the construction of a review, however humble in design. If we rush, for the clearance and arrangement of our ideas, to the table of contents, we only find ourselves in a labyrinth, sixteen pages long, of subjects discussed, questions proposed, difficulties started, without any of the various solutions supplied ready to hand, or in such a form as at all to simplify the body of the work.

Mr. Faber delighted in mysticism, in the secrets of prophecy, and the great unknown speculations suggested by the depths of the past, and the furthest anticipations of the future; by fathomless divings towards the right and left, the above and below, of human thought, and therefore he approaches not seldom on what are altogether irrational subjects of contemplation. His love of the mystic was the affection of a combatant for his foe, or of a sportsman for his game: he delighted in it, not as a serene subject of meditation, but in order to pursue and destroy it; he thought it his vocation to solve all doubtful and confusing assumptions into plain and tangible facts, whether they refer to the past or are prospective. The world, as it were, stood before him, together with the sun, moon, and stars; he also beheld human beings, and the various productive functions of nature; invisible beings also were revealed to him, both good and bad, on authority which he credited; prophetic announcements also were given on the same authority, while human instinct and the light of science had much to reveal, all of which he was anxious to include in any system which he formed.

All these things then were his material, and the task which he undertook and imagined to be feasible was, to sort the various elements and beings before him into their proper places, and apportion to each his definite and tangible abode. In the pursuit of this laborious task he is neither carried away, from its gradual and steady progress towards solution, by any rapturous anticipation of glory on the one side, nor by the most gloomy and terrific pictures of eternal ruin on the other. A stern work was commenced, and must be finished with logical exactness, come what would; nay, even at the risk of almost exciting a smile by the sudden transformation, in the

Digitized by Google

mind of the reader, of things and ideas, hitherto altogether mystical, into the plainest and most intelligible scenes, described with the dry phraseology of science, and the most simple-minded enthusiasm of purpose. The 'Many Mansions in the House of the Father' form a subject of speculation which Mr. Faber is unwilling to pass over, as many do, under the general idea of the word heaven, with all the vague hopes and misty ideas of a future life; to define which is often thought presumptuous. Perhaps indeed it has been too much the tendency of Protestantism to discourage all attempts at judging of what is unseen by the seen, at forming ideas of the future by analogy with the present, or indeed at fixing any definite images on beings which are spiritual. Matter itself is almost pronounced evil, by a resuscitated gnosticism apparent in modern times. It is considered to be carnal-mindedness when visions of the future are framed out of anything that is connected with our present experience: all that we now see or do must be obliterated from the soul's recollection; and the reward which is to come at the end of the world is to be of a nature wholly different from any conceptions which the existing order of things is calculated to suggest, even in way of type. The doctrine of the resurrection of the body has thus become vague and confused; the intermediate state is solved by the simple process of sleep; so great has been the reaction from the Romish system of active communications between the living and the dead in purgatory, that the presence of spirits and angels surrounding our earthly life, either for good or harm, is made a topic of mere sentiment or even of hilarity, rather than a part of our real conviction as Christians. Mr. Faber was distressed at this hazy outline in that western horizon of life, which he saw before him as the great future of his own existence; he must have better defined objects of faith, or he could scarcely feel the splendour of that great consoling truth that death is swallowed up in victory.

With such convictions on his mind, he inquires first, what is meant by the 'Father's House.' This, he concludes can be no less than the great celestial universe, comprehending all created worlds. He has little difficulty in deciding on the mooted question as to whether there are inhabitants in other worlds besides our own. To imagine these spheres created for no purpose but to twinkle in our eyes, appears to Mr. Faber like the *ἀνήριθμον γελασμα* of Æschylus. Each star, then, and planet is a mansion created for the residence of blessed and happy beings, forming part of the one great House or Temple of the uncreated Deity.

From two passages in the Epistle to the Hebrews, Mr. Faber conceives that he has established a strong argument for the

Digitized by Google

similarity of all the celestial bodies with our own world. Unless he can have some assurance that this is the case, his idea of there being various mansions in one great house is materially injured. The expression, 'By whom also He made the worlds,' and also, 'By faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God,' are supposed to allude to the same material worlds, which are the mansions of the one great heaven. The moon and the stars, together with the earth and the sun, are the host of heaven, and that which we know of one out of this host, viz. the earth, we may, in some sort, predicate of the others. We may indeed; but what impartial critic could for an instant lay any weight on such a construction?

Among other instances of wild assertions and loose arguments, Mr. Faber claims a material body, though, as he wisely adds, of a highly attenuated nature, for the state of existence through which we pass between death and the resurrection. Scriptural proof is adduced under this head, and what will our readers imagine this consists of? The whole statement is made chiefly to rest on the appearance of Samuel, when called by the witch of Endor. Another proof is, however, added which we cannot omit. The vision which appeared to Eliphaz, the Temanite, described as an 'image before his eyes,' is supposed to have been a disembodied spirit (*probably* of Abraham, it is most strangely asserted,) with a visible and material form.

Another absurd specimen of the materialistic ideas, which seem to have haunted Mr. Faber's brain, is afforded by the analogy which S. Paul describes between the grain of wheat and the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. The statement made in the following passage we must hand over to the consideration of physiologists:—

'Now, unless the whole of this illustrative explanation be quite wide of the mark and nothing at all to the purpose, there must be in every Human Body a material germ, analogous to the material germ in a grain of wheat: a germ, I apprehend, so small, as to elude the search of the most skilful anatomist; yet a germ, absolutely indestructible, and, on the known principles of Matter, capable of *Indefinite Extension* and thus even of *Visibility*.

'From S. Paul's illustration, *so much*, I think, is clear and certain. But, whether the indestructible germ, be or be not, associated with the Disembodied Spirit; and whether, in a state of great expansion and consequent rareness, it does, or does not, constitute the subtle clothing or vehicle of the Disembodied Spirit: it would, I suppose, be presumptuous to determine positively. We may, however, say; that, if it *be* thus associated, we should possess a *physical* mean of accounting for the *scripturally* recorded Visibility of more than one Disembodied Spirit.'—Pp. 99, 100.

Mr. Faber's great aim and object in thus establishing the material character of man under every stage of his existence is, to prove the necessity of a future material residence, and to throw

Digitized by Google

an air of probability upon the history and the prospects of the world, which he so methodically lays down for our instruction. What then, in few words, is the history, and what are the prospects, of our globe which he would have us believe in as something not only speculative but approaching to the definite and certain? With regard to the past, he invokes geology to prove that the earth already has passed through many eras of a gradually progressive nature, separated from each other by convulsions, but springing up each time more perfect than before. So far there is nothing fresh or new in his remarks, but we confess to have been rather startled by the announcement that during these geological eras the world was governed by that angel of God, who afterwards fell and became the serpent of Eden, or the devil. The great progress indeed which was made in the earth, and the unfolding glories of its inner nature as each period of change come over it, were the very cause of Satan's fall. Inflated by the dignity of his viceregal authority, he aimed at the independence of his kingdom, and therefore was cast out. On the fall of Satan, God, Mr. Faber at once most boldly concludes, created man to be his successor, and thus he accounts, on the common principles of jealousy, for the intense hatred of Satan against our own race; a feeling which he possesses a certain power to gratify during the present state of the world.

But now for the future. As changes have taken place in the world, the traces of which are perceptible, Mr. Faber concludes that the future change foretold in Scripture will only be of a similar kind. Forthwith, therefore, he rushes into an exact and methodical account of what will take place at the last day from the influence of fire; he defines with the greatest perspicuity what will be the order of events at the second advent. The well-known passage of S. Peter, descriptive of the new heavens and the new earth is made to substantiate whatever Mr. Faber's own imagination may depict to be the future residence of man. The whole earth he conceives will be burnt, or changed by the influence of fire into a sublimated state, after which by ordinary chemical laws certain dense particles will be precipitated into the form of a crust or shell. During this process the saints will 'meet the Lord in the air,' and then return with Him to occupy the exterior of this shell, as their future heaven. Was ever heathen dream more gross and material than the picture thus broadly asserted to be the ascertained hope of our new and spiritual life?

The most painful efforts, however, which Mr. Faber indulges in, while speculating on the future, are those which relate to Satan and his angels, including of course the lost of mankind. Mr. Faber is sternly methodical in this part of his subject,

Digitized by Google

almost as though he were engaged in an epic poem. Satan, indeed, plays no small part in the whole theory which he enunciates; for, as being the prince of the powers of the air, all his history is inalienably linked with that of earth. We have already stated, the imagined connexion between Satan and the past ages of the world. We are not, then, if we adopt this theory, to suppose that when the serpent stealthily crept into the garden of Eden, he had hitherto been a stranger to the earth. He had long known it; he had long dwelt on it; his recollections penetrated far behind that dark era of chaos, which immediately preceded the Mosaic cosmogony, and brought to his fallen state the grievous memory of better and happier times. Hence his natural malignity against man, who was created to supplant him. Struggle after struggle followed, and too many have fallen in his snares, but yet man was destined at last to triumph. When the Redeemer of the world Himself became man, then was Satan's grand effort to regain once more his kingdom; and when the Cross at length was upraised from the earth for the death of that Holy Victim, who had come down from heaven and taken upon Him our nature, then it almost appeared that Satan's day was at hand, that his hour of triumph had arrived. In Mr. Faber's rather quaint language, he found himself, however, 'considerably mistaken;' his liberty forthwith received a check, his head was bruised; though still he possessed a power to wander over the earth, leading all those astray, from their allegiance to the true God, whom he could tempt with his snares.

Such then being the condition of Satan and his host in the present age of divine dispensations, we have next to contemplate his future actions, and also his eternal portion. During the Millennium, Mr. Faber supposes him to be literally bound in the Domdaniel caverns of the earth, from which at the end of that period he is once more released, to enjoy a brief but terrible despotism; till at last, the final catastrophe dissolves the whole earth, ends his power for all ages, and leaves him in the eternal punishment, which is allotted to him by divine justice. And where is the dungeon in which Satan, with his evil hosts, and with all lost mankind, are to be for ever confined? Here Mr. Faber gives us the complement of Burnet's wild speculations, and presents us with what might not unjustly be termed 'Telluris Theoria Diabolica.' Mr. Faber, while engaged on this most awful topic, seems to revel in the wildest horrors of a diseased imagination, with Miltonian zest; made all the more striking by the cool and technical method of his descriptions. After stating, as we have already said, that the fire of judgment will remodel the earth into a large hollow shell, through which there will never more be an opening between

Digitized by Google

the exterior and interior, he proceeds to make accurate calculations about the capability of this interior to form for ever the penal abode of the lost. Let the following passage suffice to illustrate this part of the subject:—

'If, then, there should be *even no* enlargement of our Planet's diameter in the process of its renovation, when the Shell of the New Earth occupies the position of the Shell of the Old Earth; *still*, as now, that diameter would be eight thousand miles. Taking this measure as the basis of our calculation, let us suppose the Shell of the New Earth to be of the uniform thickness of a thousand miles.' On such a supposition, we shall have an interior hollow Space of six thousand miles in diameter. Hence, if we ascribe a diameter of two thousand miles (which is a trifle less than the diameter of the Moon) to an Ignited Central Nucleus: we shall finally have a circular Space, of two thousand miles in every radiating direction, between the Central Nucleus and the Interior Face of the Shell.

'Thus ample will be the lurid Space even on the *present* conjectural reckoning. But the probability is, that our Renovated Planet will, in its diameter, be very considerably enlarged. We have, indeed, no reason to believe, that a single particle of *new* Matter, either has been, or will be, added to our Globe, since its original creation out of nothing: yet, if the specific gravity of the *whole* be diminished by an enlargement of the lurid Space between the Fiery Central Ruin of the Old World and the circumscribing Shell which will constitute the New Earth of the Blessed, this Shell itself being diminished proportionably either in thickness or in material solidity; a fearfully sufficient amplitude of room will be provided for the Infernal Prison of the Damned.

'How the supposed Space, between the solid Centrical Nucleus and the inferior Side of the Circumscribing Shell which acts as an enormous arch, will be occupied, must, to a certain extent, be a matter of conjecture. It is, however, probable (and the probability may seem to be confirmed by SCRIPTURE), that this vast Space will be filled with liquid fire, forming a sort of circumambient Ocean to the Continent of the solid Centrical Ignited Nucleus. Such may be, what in SCRIPTURE is styled, more than once, the LAKE of Fire and Brimstone: a fiery DELUGE, as our great poet speaks, fed with ever-burning sulphur unconsumed.'—Pp. 257—259.

With all the respect that is due to Mr. Faber's talents and personal character, can we describe him as otherwise than a melancholy enthusiast, when after having written such passages as the foregoing, he concludes the book in which they appear, with the following solemn words?—

'As I approach the confines of another state of existence; as the blossoms of the grave have now long whitened my head; I sensibly feel my footsteps strengthened, my hopes elevated, and my consolations increased, by that *definiteness* which God has so graciously imparted in his HOLY WORD. On the verge of Eternity, I have the sensation of a sure footing: and I trust, that it makes me a better man, to have ascertained *definitely* the LOCALITIES of what, through Christ's Merits, may be my Future Progress, instead of plunging into Regions of Unknown Space with no antecedent clearness of conception.'—P. 423.

Let it not be supposed, from the tone in which we have criticised the work before us, that we condemn all speculation on the things which are unseen. Scripture plainly leads us on

Digitized by Google

to the subject, and by its prophetical announcements would seem to give its sanction to the reverent consideration of a future state. Nor, again, do we think that the investigations of physical science are to be without their influence in any judgments we may form. The laws of analogy also must have their force, and it is natural that we picture the scenes of a heavenly condition in some measure from the better parts of our present experience. It is an allowable, and indeed, a happy thought, that our future state is not to be one of entire change from all our present associations, but that the brighter elements of the present world, those, which in the beginning were pronounced very good, will survive the last fiery trial, and be our companions in eternity. To believe otherwise would deprive the present world of half its charms and all its glory, for it would drive us to the conclusion that all matter was in itself evil. God created the world with far too many signs of His greatness impressed upon it, for us to believe that the inherent powers of beauty and of increase, which all things contain, are to be wasted and destroyed: it is no mere common-place or unreal sentiment that the beauties of nature, nay, the flowers of the world, whether literal or figurative, are a foretaste and a type of heaven.

What, however, we do most seriously object to is, turning such speculations into little better than a burlesque of holy and unknown things. On subjects which are meant to be shrouded in mystery, or only approached in the dim religious light of a well-ordered and deeply poetic fancy, it is simply ridiculous to assume the dry technical language of exact description. We cannot therefore acquit the author of such random speculations as are contained in the book before us, from the charge of lamentable irreverence. Little, indeed, was it his purpose to write otherwise than with becoming dignity on the topics which he undertook; but in this fact we only see another instance of a very common failing in active-minded men, viz., that they are often wholly unconscious of their true vocation. The study of religious speculation belongs to the higher class of poetic minds, and is only tolerable when thus treated. It is needless to add that Mr. Faber, however estimable he was, whatever talents he possessed, was not thus qualified for the task. The result therefore will be deemed, we think, a painful failure in the estimation of thoughtful and considerate persons.

Digitized by Google

ART. III.—1. *First Report of Her Majesty's Commissioners, appointed Nov.* 10, A.D. 1852, *to inquire into the State and Condition of the Cathedral and Collegiate Churches in England and Wales. Presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty.* 1854. *With an Appendix.*

2. *Cathedral Reform. A Letter to the Members of his Diocese, from* WALTER KERR, *Bishop of Salisbury, &c.* London: Rivingtons.

IT must be confessed, that the Reformed Church of England has hitherto exhibited but an imperfect conception of the uses of religious corporations. Whether it be the marriage of the clergy, or the domestic turn of the national mind, or whatever other cause, that hinders the development among us of the collegiate—not to say cœnobitical—life, it is certain that our ideas of clerical efficiency have been almost exclusively connected with parochial and pastoral ministrations. Valuing our Reformation on its retention of capitular establishments, which the ultra-Protestant movement would have swept away as little better than monkery, we have been always at some loss to know what to do with them. Pious people often tremble for the spirituality of a favourite clergyman when honoured with a Cathedral preferment; and every one is on the watch to prevent dignities which are tolerated—perhaps justified—as parts of a system which must adapt itself to all grades of society, from encroaching too far on the more important avocations of the Christian priesthood. Nor is this altogether a modern jealousy. It is an inheritance perhaps from the days of the Reformation, when the corruptions of religious houses, regarded by eyes which longed—as Bishop Fisher told the House of Lords—for the *goods* more than the *good* of the Church, precipitated a catastrophe, little likely to leave the public mind in an impartial frame towards collegiate institutions. The traces of it are evident in the Canons of 1603, drawn up under Bancroft with the avowed object of sustaining Church principles. While enjoining a variety of directions for the due performance of parochial duties, these Canons are almost silent on the subject of Cathedral reform. An order for the use of *copes*[1] seems but poorly seconded by directions to celebrate Holy Communion 'upon *principal* feast days,' and so as for every member of the foundation to receive '*four* times yearly at the least.' Beyond this, the most that seemed then expected from Cathedral Chapters, was that some of their number should assist the bishop in examining and

[1] Canon xxiv.

Digitized by Google

ordaining priests[1]—a regulation feebly enjoined, and vigorously neglected; that the dean should reside ninety days *conjunctim aut divisim* (unless dispensed with by the bishop), keep hospitality, and see that the vicars-choral study the Scriptures;[2] that both he and the canons should *preach* while in residence (yet in other churches as well as in the Cathedral);[3] and, finally, that they should inform the bishop of any unsound doctrine preached in their pulpit.[4] This is certainly a very moderate amount of duty in return for noble emoluments; and such appears to have been the opinion of those who enjoined it. For the Forty-fourth Canon *inhibits* prebendaries not residentiary from absenting themselves from their benefices, 'under colour of their prebends;' and further enjoins the residentiaries so 'to sort and proportion' the residence among them (which by the statutes should be kept by all in common), as 'presently to repair to their benefices, *or some one of them*, or to some other charge where the law requireth their presence, there to discharge their duties according to the laws in that case provided.' The notion plainly was, that Cathedrals only kept the clergy away from more necessary duties: and this is the notion stamped on all subsequent legislation. A Cathedral dignity is a lucrative preferment without any real employment. The rights of the patron and the doctrine of 'prizes,' form the chief reasons for its retention; and the efforts of reform are directed towards preventing too many of them from accumulating to one man's share, or to seeing that his legalised *otium* does not detain the prize-holder too long from the more genuine obligations of a clergyman. Hence our royal statutes and episcopal injunctions have been mostly directed to restraining instead of enforcing residence,—to narrowing instead of extending corporate action. In the true spirit of such legislation, a bishop still living is said, as a matter of conscience, to bestow his Cathedral preferment upon those claimants on his patronage, whom he considers the least qualified for the more important responsibility of a parochial charge!

The legislation of later years is assuredly not to be complimented on exhibiting any deeper insight into the uses of Cathedral establishments. The framers of the Ecclesiastical Commission in 1835 might be thought to have adopted as the basis of their reforms Rob Roy's morality—

> '. . . . . the good old rule,
> Sufficeth them, the simple plan,
> That they should take, who have the power,
> And they should keep who can.'

Money was urgently required for the augmentation of poor

[1] Canon xxxv. [2] Canon xlii. [3] Canon xlii. [4] Canon li.

Digitized by Google

benefices, and the increase of parochial ministrations; the Cathedrals had money, with no duties which the public cared for, to discharge; all the Commission had to do was to seize upon these revenues, and apply them to the more imperative wants of the Church. The process would occasion a sad diminution in the number and splendour of clerical 'prizes;' but as 'existing interests' were to be respected, the loss would chiefly affect the future *patronage*, and this the Crown and the bishops made up their minds to submit to. Sir R. Peel, in his place in Parliament, went so far as to compliment the hierarchy on the 'sacrifices' thus made for the good of the Church; though in truth not a single bishop or canon was in any degree injured, while some were largely benefited by the scheme. The loss fell on their unnamed successors, and yet more heavily upon the people who should have benefited by foundations thus directed to another use. No inquiry was instituted, whether the Cathedrals themselves were capable of being invested with a more extended usefulness, or whether any of the 'existing rights' so scrupulously preserved, might not be flagrant abuses demanding correction by the visitor. No one, either, seems to have much cared what would become of these establishments when the process of depletion should be complete;—all such considerations were disregarded in the one idea of a fund for parochial purposes. In the well-remembered language of the energetic prelate who championed the design, 'the wants of the flock 'were so urgent, that he must have all the money he could lay 'his hands upon.' Hence a deaf ear was turned to the remonstrances of the few who appreciated the spiritual value of capitular establishments. The deans and chapters themselves were only listened to when they could urge some personal pecuniary claim; and too many of these dignitaries—like the witty canon of S. Paul's—dropped their protest as soon as their bargain was made, turned their backs on the sacred rights so solemnly obtested, and contentedly swam with the stream.

After this sort a measure was hurried through Parliament, which it has been the fashion to style a great ecclesiastical reform. That some advantages have resulted, it would be foolish to deny; but at what cost were they purchased?. The Ecclesiastical Commission has unsettled a vast amount of ancient foundations; familiarized men's minds with an enormous traffic in church-lands, livings, and jurisdictions; occasioned no little scandal against particular dignitaries; and proved a 'good thing' to the solicitors and speculators, who have enjoyed the stewardship of ecclesiastical manors, and the fingering of ecclesiastical moneys.

On the other hand, as a scheme for augmenting poor benefices,

Digitized by Google

it has notoriously failed. It has been obliged to suspend even its own moderate promises to benefices in public patronage, and now only deals with the few which possess a local claim on the revenues coming under its disposal. Its one work, in short, is the endowment of the 'Peel districts;' and, without undervaluing the impetus thus given to church building, or the yet more praiseworthy efforts of the many zealous and self-denying clergymen, who have laboured and died in these home missionary fields, we have yet to be satisfied,—1st, that one bishop, at 5,000*l.* a-year, and a multitude of district incumbents at 150*l.*, constitute the best ecclesiastical establishment for a wealthy manufacturing town in the nineteenth century:—and, 2dly, that the assistance proffered to such towns by spoliating the religious foundations of other places, has not tended to prevent the application of their overflowing wealth to new endowments of their own.[1]

To whatever extent, however, the Ecclesiastical Commission may have proved advantageous to the *parochial* branch of the Church's system, it can assuredly lay little claim to the credit of any *Cathedral* reform. In this respect its idea was simple even to coarseness. The majority of the Cathedrals were perceived

[1] The public is little aware of all that goes to the completion of one of these 'New Parishes.' The districts are severed from the mother Church at the first stroke, and constituted independent cures. They consist, for the most part, of large masses of labouring and pauper population, sunk in spiritual, intellectual, and material destitution. We know a manufacturing town in which *nine* of these districts, containing from five to eight thousand souls a-piece, were thus cut off at once from the parish church and the vicar. Some of them received ministers of their own, who forthwith began the hard struggle to erect a church; others lay vacant for three or four years—a greater spiritual waste than ever—and were at last given away in despair to any one in priest's orders who could be got to accept them. Such clergymen, with their miserable stipends, their pauper population, their wretched 'licensed rooms,' assembling three or four old women—on rare occasions, perhaps a dozen—for Divine service on the Sunday, are the embodiment of meanness in religion. Even the most successful results are sometimes achieved at a fearful price. An ardent young curate is induced to exchange his happy employment for one of these destitute incumbencies. His first object is, of course, a church. By spending and being spent, annoying his friends, irritating his acquaintance, and experiencing rebuffs which would mortify a bankrupt tradesman, he gets heavily forward with a subscription. Then he begins the work, entangles himself in contracts, spends his wife's two or three hundred pounds, (his own has gone in taking his degree,) and *dies*, broken-hearted and insolvent, before the church is completed. Another, and another yet, may succeed to the charge and continue the struggle, before the edifice, all meanly furnished and saddled still with debt, is declared ready for consecration. And then the bishop's sermon will, perhaps, call on the congregation to rejoice in the rapid extension of the Church; while a couple of widows and a dozen of fatherless children are ruing the bitter day when the poor victims (now forgotten by all but them) cast themselves beneath the wheels of her chariot. Meantime, the laity, in many places, exasperated by the importunity of these clerical *duns*, are demanding that no more clergymen be appointed than there are churches to officiate in. It is certainly a grievous defect that the *parishioners* are allowed no voice in these rearrangements of parochial bounds and spiritual relations.

Digitized by Google

to possess two sorts of canons or prebendaries,—the one residentiary, the other not,—the former burdened with no very important duties, the latter with none at all. The residentiaries, again, varied in number and emolument in different Cathedrals; and deaneries were found to range from 600*l.* a-year to hard upon 5,000*l.* Let the deans be equalized at 1,000*l.* a-year, and the residentiaries at 500*l.*; perhaps as much as public opinion would 'stand' for dignities confessedly of no great practical utility. Let there be *four* residentiaries in every Cathedral,—one for each of the four seasons—and abolish the non-residentiary members altogether: their duties—the duties they might, could, would, or should have done—to be thrown to the winds, their patronage to escheat to the bishops, and their endowments, with the surplus revenue from the residentiaries, to form the fund for pastoral extension. Such, with a little garnishing in the case of two or three Cathedrals, where the larger *haul* seemed to warrant a little more liberality, was the scheme of the Ecclesiastical Commission. No consideration was given to differences in the original foundation; all difficulties connected with the statutes being surmounted by a summary power of repeal granted to the Chapters themselves. Neither were local circumstances deemed worthy of any greater discrimination. No larger Chapter was provided for the metropolitical city of York than for the country town of Wells,—the Cathedral being of no very definite advantage (it must have been surmised) to either. On the other hand, a *fourth* residentiary was set up at Lincoln, where the statutes required but three: and the whole four were imported into Ripon, which had never enjoyed nor discovered the want of any![1] Such additions in violation of the leading 'principle'—money for pastoral purposes—could only have been introduced on the profound theory of uniformity which obtains in the *compo* style of church architecture:—unless, indeed, it was thought that one bishop ought to have as many 'prizes' to bestow as another.

It was happily suggested by somebody, that since the money only was needed for the Ecclesiastical Commission, they might be content, with regard to the non-residentiary stalls, to

[1] The Bishop of Ripon actually complains of this importation, as *injurious to the Cathedral congregation*, who are positively suffering from an *embarras de richesses*:—'I cannot refrain from observing, that experience convinces me of the disadvantage that results to the spiritual interests of a parish church, such as Ripon Minster, from the great variety and frequent change of preachers. In truth, with us they are so many, and the several parties are so willing, that the great difficulty is to find turns enough to satisfy all. I should only have aggravated this embarrassment by the appointment of honorary canons: and this is one reason why I have hitherto refrained from exercising my privilege of creating them. I cannot but feel that the poor and less educated are *sufferers* by the multiplication of preachers, as systematic and consecutive teaching becomes impossible.'—App. p. 591.

Digitized by Google

'take all they had, and spare their lives.' The dignity would still be acceptable to deserving clergymen, if conferred only as an honorary mark of professional merit. It was, as a living Bishop expresses it, a stall without a manger. The idea took prodigiously: the bishops were glad of small change to pay off some of the claimants on their patronage, and Parliament was so tickled with the notion of a Cathedral dignitary *gratis*, that they extended the privilege to *all* the bishops, by founding 'honorary canonries'—the one ecclesiastical foundation of the nineteenth century—in the Cathedrals which possessed no non-resident prebends.

As it happened, however, this preservation of the non-resident stalls was something more than a feather in clerical caps. The bishops, it is true, forgot to restore the patronage which, on the notion of the suppression of the prebends, had been transferred to themselves; but all other rights and duties, according to the existing statutes of the Cathedral, were preserved by the act of Parliament. Hence the corporate bodies have remained unmutilated, and, the power of repealing whatever did not accord with this crude legislation having been but sparingly exercised, the means are still providentially retained for effecting a more genuine measure of Cathedral reform.

To this inquiry attention has at last been directed, in a manner commensurate with its importance. One of the few instances in which Lord Derby's short-lived administration fulfilled the expectations it had excited in the minds of many Churchmen, was the issue of the Royal Commission, whose First Report is now lying before us: and we cannot forbear from noting, as a proof how such measures are appreciated by the clergy, that the Address to the Throne which the Archbishop of York prevented his Convocation from adopting in Synod, and which they were consequently compelled to submit to Her Majesty as individuals, selected this act of her royal authority for grateful acknowledgment.[1]

The Cathedral Commission, avoiding the fatal mistake of their predecessors, began by seeking to acquire a true conception of the actual constitution of the several capitular bodies, with the objects had in view by their founders, the modifications subsequently introduced, and the practice at the present time. For this purpose they addressed a series of questions to

[1] 'We recognise the same pious and affectionate care for the practical efficiency of the Church, in the desire, which your Majesty has ever evinced, to render our ecclesiastical establishments more conducive to the purposes for which they have been founded—the glory of God, and the edification of his people.' The first signature to this Address is '*Charles Thorpe*, Archdeacon of Durham;' and among those which follow, are those of the proctor for the Chapter of Carlisle, a canon-residentiary of Ripon, and three non-resident canons of York.

Digitized by Google

the several chapters, precentors, and organists; applied themselves to an analysis of their statutes, and also to the study of other authorities calculated to throw light upon the objects of their search. The First Report, which is now before us, states the course and general results of these judicious inquiries, and furnishes an analysis of the information and suggestions obtained from the Chapters, under the seven heads of, *Public Worship, Religious Education, Discipline, Erection of New Sees, Other Arrangements for the Discharge of Episcopal Duties, Fabric*, and *Revenue*. On all these topics a mass of information is collected in the Report and its voluminous Appendix, on which the Commissioners reserve their recommendations, till the evidence has been completely collected, digested, and weighed.

Here, then, we have the opening, at least, for such a reform as has never yet been attempted. The operations of the Ecclesiastical Commission, it may be feared, will already have diverted from many of the Cathedral establishments so large a portion of their revenues, as seriously to cripple any scheme of adequate efficiency; but it may at least be hoped that the endowments still remaining, to which the eye of spoliation has already been directed, will be honestly applied to the purposes to which the whole was solemnly devoted at the altars of the respective Cathedrals.

Our Cathedrals are generally distinguished into two classes, called the *Old* and the *New* Foundations: the former comprehending the churches originally founded for canons secular; the latter, such as were transferred from the regular orders at the Reformation, with the new Cathedrals then and subsequently founded. The churches of the Old Foundation are thirteen:—York, S. Paul's, Chichester, Exeter, Hereford, Lichfield, Lincoln, Salisbury, Wells; and the Welsh Cathedrals, S. Asaph, Bangor, Llandaff, and S. David's. The *conventual* churches are Canterbury, Durham, Carlisle, Ely, Norwich, Rochester, Winchester, and Worcester; which, though dignified with episcopal sees before the Reformation, were administered by *monastic* Chapters. The Cathedrals founded with new sees by Henry VIII. are Bristol, Peterborough, Oxford, Gloucester, and Chester. And to these are to be added the two collegiate churches of Ripon and Manchester, which have been converted into Cathedrals in our own day. A general uniformity prevails throughout the charters and statutes of each class: and to give a proper idea of each, the Commissioners have printed extracts from the statutes of some one or more, including the statutes in full of Lichfield, Ely, Chester, and Westminster.

Digitized by Google

The Cathedrals of the Old Foundation are assigned to a period extending from the Conquest to the Reformation. In these the bishop was the pre-eminent authority, being usually the founder, and always the visitor and chief legislator. The following is a general description of these foundations:—

'The Dean and Chapter are only amenable to the Bishop's jurisdiction as a body, in chapter assembled. All offences of individual members are corrected by the authority of the Dean, according to the capitular Statutes.

'The four first members next after the Bishop, are called "Personæ Principales," and are bound to continual residence, each having his distinct sphere of duty.

'The DEAN, elected by the Chapter, summoned for that purpose, was next to the Bishop in honour and authority, to be reverenced and obeyed by all the members of the Church. To him was assigned a part of the daily divine offices, the cure of souls in the precinct, the chief care of discipline and morals, and archidiaconal authority over all the churches in the cathedral city. He also exercised the same authority, either alone, or conjointly with the Chapter, over the churches annexed to prebends and those appropriated to the Chapter. (In some Cathedrals there was a Sub-Dean, to act for the Dean in his absence;[1] in others, the duty of the Dean devolved on the Precentor.)

'The PRECENTOR, next in rank to the Dean, was charged with the regulation and direction of the divine services, assigning to each person his proper part, and leading the choir, either personally or by his *Succentor*. He was answerable for the instruction and discipline of the choristers, and for the selection of fit candidates to supply vacancies. To him belonged the care of providing and correcting the manuscript music for the service of the church, and keeping the books in proper condition.

'To the CHANCELLOR was committed the department of theology, and learning in general. It was his duty to superintend the reading of the Scriptures in the Choir, and to see that they were well and distinctly read; to preach, and to arrange the cycle of preachers, both in the Cathedral Church and elsewhere; to deliver theological lectures; to nominate schoolmasters in the city, and in other places; to preserve the sacred books used in the choir, and the library of the church; to keep the chapter seal (in conjunction with the Treasurer); to write the letters of the Chapter, and a record of all proceedings. This office is quite distinct from that of the Chancellor of the diocese. He was assisted in these duties by the *Vice-Chancellor*, or *Scribe*.

'The TREASURER was the guardian of the fabric and all the furniture and ornaments of the Church; he was bound to furnish at his own expense some of the requisites for the divine services; to him belonged the superintendence of the inferior ministers of the church. His assistant was the *Sacrist* or *Sub-Sacrist*.

'The ARCHDEACONS, who in the former period seem to have been attached to the Bishop, as his assistants at home and abroad, without any distinct sphere of jurisdiction, began soon after the Conquest to have each a certain province, with duties similar to those which they exercise at this time. Being much occupied with the visitation of churches in their several districts, they were allowed to keep a shorter term of residence than

[1] This *Sub-Dean* is not however to be confounded with the *Vice-Dean* in Cathedrals of the New Foundation, who is always one of the Canons, and next in rank to the Dean.—See p. 352.

Digitized by Google

the other Canons, but were obliged to maintain a Vicar. In the Church of St. Paul's, London, they appear to have had precedence next to the Dean, in other churches after the Four Principal Persons. They were enjoined to hold rural Chapters in the several deaneries of their districts, and there to deliver to the rural Deans and parochial Clergy the injunctions issued by the General Council.

'The CANONS consisted of Presbyters, Deacons, and Sub-deacons, each prebendal stall being annexed to one of those three orders of ministry; and a certain number of each order, as the services of the Church then required, were enjoined to be always resident together. It appears to have been a general rule, that a certain part of the whole body of Canons should be always in residence.

'Each Canon was bound to maintain a *Vicar* skilled in music, to supply his place when absent, in the ministrations of the Church. This seems to be the origin of the Minor Canons.

'The ancient Statutes are full of regulations for the solemn worship of Almighty God, especially on Sundays and high festivals, and other important occasions, assigning certain portions of the divine offices to the Bishop, Dean, and other members. Sermons are to be preached, either by the Bishop or some other member of the Church, especially the Chancellor, to the people on every Lord's day; to the Clergy in Chapter assembled on week days, (at particular seasons,) and on certain festivals. The cycle of sermons is arranged by the Chancellor, with the sanction of the Bishop.

'The Four Principal Persons, and the Archdeacons, had each a separate endowment either of land or tithes; they were also sometimes (not always) endowed with one of the prebends of the church. The prebends varied much in number, the Cathedral of Lincoln having the largest number, fifty-two. The Canons had each a prebend,[1] the endowment of which generally consisted of the tithes of some parish.

'There was, besides, a common property of the Church, called *Communa*, from the revenues of which the several members received a daily distribution, when resident and taking their part in the divine offices. The Bishop sometimes had a portion of this *Communa;* the share of the Dean was double that of a Canon.'—*Report*, pp. vi. vii.

In addition to their duties of daily recurrence, the Chapter formed the council of the bishop in the administration of the diocese, especially *contra hæreses et schismata*. Frequent notices of such councils, as well as of the diocesan synod, are to be found in Wilkins's 'Concilia,' and meetings appear to have been held at Salisbury, under the presidency of the bishop, on several occasions since the Reformation. This council consisted of course of the *whole* Chapter; the distinction of residentiary and non-residentiary canons being of later date, and never affecting this part of the capitular functions.

The Chapters were also anciently guardians both of the temporalties and spiritualties of the see during a vacancy; and by the provisions of Magna Charta, were to elect their bishop free from external dictation. This privilege, however, as is well

[1] It should be remembered the *canon* was a name of office and ministry; *prebenda* signified an endowment or revenue, the person enjoying which was called *prebendarius*.

Digitized by Google

known, was perpetually interfered with, both by the pope and the monarch.

In these Chapters (it has been observed) there was originally no distinction between resident and non-resident canons. All were alike designed to keep residence, serve the church, and live at the common table; and none were to be absent from the Cathedral, but with leave of the body or the bishop. In process of time, however, this rule was modified. 'As early as 'A.D. 1319, (say the Chapter of Salisbury,) irregularities had 'crept into the body, and residence was ill kept.' Orders were then issued for *one-fourth* of the whole body to reside in rotation each quarter of the year. In another century, this grew to be the same individuals (in number one-fourth of the whole), residing all the year round, while the other three-fourths were permanently absent. The causes of these changes are said to be, the expense of keeping hospitality while in residence, and the desire of the canons to look after their separate prebends. A contribution was not unfrequently levied from the non-residents of one-fifth, one-sixth, or one-seventh of these prebends, for the benefit of the common estate. In this manner *canons-residentiary* came to be established in all the Cathedrals, and (though at first it was otherwise) they gradually excluded the non-resident members from their voice in the chapter, which managed the common estate and directed the service of the church. This continued for the most part down to the beginning of the Reformation. A remarkable statute was then issued by Henry VIII. to the Cathedral of York, which forms part of its governing laws at the present day. After severely rebuking the luxury and idleness of the canons in residence, the royal reformer proceeds as follows:—

'Statuimus quod omnes et singuli canonici ejusdem ecclesiæ, etiam non residentiarii, quos tunc in civitate nostrâ Eborum adesse contigerit, ad omnia acta capitularia, seu alias ipsam ecclesiam vel capitulum tangentia, vocentur; et de eorundem canonicorum tunc presentium seu majoris partis consensu, omnia acta predicta tractentur et expediantur, aliorum absentium et monitorum contumatiis non obstantibus, cum constat eosdem canonicos etiam non residentiarios fratres et membra ejusdem ecclesiæ esse, ac capitulum ejusdem ecclesiæ cum cæteris canonicis facere.'—*Appendix*, p. (18).

By this opportune enactment, the non-resident canons of York enjoy their seats in chapter to the present day;—being, we believe, the only Cathedral in which that privilege is retained. Even here, however, the residentiary influence seems to have been exerted after the old spirit; for one of the Injunctions issued by the late Archbishop of York on the occasion of his celebrated visitation, A.D. 1841, enforces the observance of this very statute, which it had been attempted

Digitized by Google

to set aside. And still, we are told, the common mode of obeying it is to place a citation on the chapter-house door, where the canons can but seldom know of its existence: so that not only are the non-resident members not offered the opportunity of coming to York, but when actually in the city and even attending the church, Chapters have been held on important matters without their knowledge. There is no question, however, of the *right;* and as the other Cathedrals of the Old Foundation are similarly constituted, it may be concluded that, at the time of the Reformation, all the canons possessed *de jure* an equal voice in the chapter, while a certain number, (ordinarily a fourth of the whole,) together with one of the *quatuor personæ,* were expected to be in *constant* residence.

The Cathedrals of Winchester, Worcester, Canterbury, Durham, and Rochester, were also originally founded for canons secular; but in the two former, by the influence of Dunstan, and in the others by that of Lanfranc, these were replaced by monks. Norwich was founded as a Benedictine convent; and became a Cathedral by the translation of the see from Thetford; while the sees of Ely and Carlisle were founded (*temp.* Hen. I.) in monasteries already existing in those cities. In these eight churches, then, the prior and his monks formed the cathedral chapter, retaining, of course, the rule of their order. In this capacity they acted as the bishop's council, and discharged the other functions of a dean and chapter much as in the old Cathedrals.

On the abolition of the regular Orders under Henry VIII. new statutes were framed by royal authority for the government of these churches, which, together with those of the bishoprics then founded, constitute what are called the Cathedrals of the New Foundation. They are distinguished from the Old Foundation by containing a much smaller body of canons; the highest number being twelve, the lowest four; corresponding to the number of *residentiaries* in the other Cathedrals. Of the *quatuor personæ,* who filled so high a dignity in the older scheme, they retain only the dean, who is appointed immediately by the Crown, instead of being elected, as in the others, under a *congé d'élire.* In some cases, also, the Crown or the Lord Chancellor has the nomination of the canons in these Cathedrals. The dean has no longer the jurisdiction over the city churches, the archdeacons are not members of the chapter, and the precentor, (like the succentor vicariorum in the other churches,) subsides into a minor canon.

In the churches of the New Foundation there are no separate endowments of particular stalls, but the whole is common property. All the canons were bound to perpetual residence, with

Digitized by Google

an allowance of 100 days' absence to the dean, and eighty to a canon, provided that one-third or one-fourth part of the number were always present. In other respects, the Chapters of the New Foundation are enjoined to the same duties with the Old; the daily offering of prayer and praise, with hymns and chanting, and diligent preaching, being particularly mentioned. The principal distinction appears to be, that no express provision is made for the bishop taking part in divine service, nor is he invariably the visitor.

We may infer from these features in the New Foundations what was now the standard idea of Cathedral establishments. The bishop had greatly loosened the intimate union formerly subsisting between himself and the Chapter, and through the Chapter with the diocese. The dean had absorbed into his own office the duties and influence anciently shared by the precentor, chancellor, and treasurer; the non-resident canons were practically excluded from the Chapter, and the resident body had assumed more the air of a distinct order in the Church, independent to some extent both of the bishop and the diocese, and possibly intended to sustain the influence of the Crown, as the monks had supported that of the pope. Still *collective* residence was enjoined; the duty of hospitality, and the relief of the poor, were enforced; and the Chapter was declared to be, after the example of the primitive Church, 'assistant to the bishop, as 'his presbytery in all weightier matters, and specially that 'heresies and false doctrines may be checked and expelled.'

Cranmer, it is well known, laboured hard to invest the Cathedrals with some of that care for sacred learning which, amid many faults, had ever distinguished the religious orders. He would have attached to them diocesan colleges of theology, and grammar-schools; and to such objects, as well as to the augmentation of poor benefices, and the extension of the episcopate, he proposed to devote a large proportion of the spoil of the monasteries. But these proposals were only very partially complied with. Provision is made in some statutes for the maintenance of a small number of students at the universities, but it does not appear to have generally taken effect.

Such, then, were our Cathedrals at the beginning of the Reformation, when the Church Ritual was as yet but little altered, and the celibacy of the clergy was still largely maintained. From this time to the reign of Charles II. a variety of amendments were introduced by royal and episcopal ordinances, which gradually changed the whole aspect of affairs.

'What had been the exception before, now becomes the rule. What had been the term allowed for necessary absence during the year, becomes now the term of residence at the Cathedral Church—ninety, sixty, and

Digitized by Google

even so little as fifty days; and in many cases the provision for the constant presence of one-third or one-fourth part of the Canons, appears to have been abandoned.'—*Report*, p. xii.

Thus, in the Statutes of Canterbury, as framed by Henry VIII., the chapter *De Residentia Decani* begins in this way:—

'Quia vigilanti rectoris oculo nihil est utilius ut omnia recte gubernentur, statuimus et volumus ut decanus *semper* domi apud ecclesiam suam resideat, nisi illum removetur impedimentum legitimum.'—*Appendix*, p. (57).

But in Charles I.'s statute, after the same preamble, on the necessity for the watchful eye of the ruler, follows this 'lame and impotent conclusion':—

'Ut decanus per *nonaginta ad minus dies* in singulis annis domi apud ecclesiam hanc nostram resideat, quorum viginti unum continuos esse volumus.'—*Ibid.*

In like manner, the chapter *De Residentia Canonicorum* commences in both statutes with the preamble, '*quandoquidem membra a capito procul sejungi non convenit*,' and so ordains equal residence on the canons with the dean: but this is first reduced from '*semper*' to the same period of ninety days, and then ordained to be so parted among them, that a fourth part at least of the prebendaries (*i. e.* three) be always personally resident.

So, again, in the other metropolitical church of York. At the Reformation the number of canons in residence is said to have been 'left uncertain:' *i. e.* probably, that it was not to fall below *nine*, (the fourth part of the canons,) exclusive of the dean; and any or all of the whole number might come into residence when they pleased, by protesting in the form prescribed by a statute of Henry VIII. This continued the law till after the Revolution, when by a statute of William III. the number of residentiaries was reduced to *five*, including the dean. Still the ancient method of 'protesting residence' continued, so that on a vacancy among the four, any other canon who first notified his intention to the dean became *ipso facto* the new residentiary. It was not till the reign of George III. that the non-resident members were deprived of this opportunity, by a statute which gives the dean a power of *selection* from among their number: and thus we are landed again in the period of modern legislation.

The Ecclesiastical Commission of 1835 was directed to consider 'the several Cathedral and collegiate churches in England and Wales, with a view to the suggestion of such measures as might render them conducive to the efficiency of the 'Established Church.' These last words they seem to have interpreted to mean, 'the diversion of the largest amount of Cathedral endowments to more important uses.' For in regard

Digitized by Google

to the efficiency of the Cathedrals themselves, the chief reform they accomplished was restoring the residence of the dean to eight months in the year, with a restriction from holding any other benefice, save in the Cathedral city and not exceeding 500*l.* per annum. Even this reform was accompanied with so great a reduction of the emoluments of the deanery, as in some cases to cripple the efficiency of the office.[1] In other respects, the evils that had crept in were retained and sanctioned, and many additional ones introduced.

i. The endowments of the non-resident canonries were altogether alienated from Cathedral uses.

ii. A number of residentiary canonries were suspended, and their endowments in like manner confiscated to other purposes.

iii. The residence of canons, which ought to be equal to the dean's, was everywhere reduced to the corrupt usage of three months, one only of the whole number being actually 'in residence.' This arrangement introduced for the first time the anomaly of a dean permanently resident at 1,000*l.* a-year, and twice that amount allotted to secure a single canon, or rather four revolving quarters of a canon, by his side.

iv. The canons-residentiary were still allowed to hold benefices, though only one each, in distant parts of the country; so perpetuating the practice of pluralities, with the scandal of withdrawing the pastor of a parish church from his proper duties to idle away his time at a Cathedral.

v. For no attempt was made to remove the reproach under which the Cathedrals had laboured, by attaching any more definite duties either to deans or canons.

vi. Some canonries were annexed to professorships, and some to parishes,—a measure, which, instead of helping to reform the Cathedral, operated as another form of alienating its revenues.

vii. The minor canons also were reduced in number, without in any way being rendered more efficient; on the contrary, these also were permitted to retain parochial charges, and to that extent withdraw themselves from Cathedral duty.

In all these respects the legislation of the Ecclesiastical Commission inflicted a series of heavy blows on the already enervated frames of our capitular bodies. A trifling improvement was aimed at by the enactment which provided that no person who had not been six years in priest's orders should be appointed

[1] The deanery of York, for instance, worth 3,000*l.* a-year, was reduced to 1,000*l.*, a sum so inadequate, that in a bill subsequently introduced, but never passed, it was attempted to raise it to 2,000*l.* A Dean of York or Wells, with a palace to keep up, on a single 1,000*l.* a-year, after the calls of his station are considered, is probably no better off than a country vicar of 300*l* a-year.

Digitized by Google

a dean, archdeacon, or canon: and some useful limitations were placed on the exercise of the patronage left with the Chapter, which were *not* imposed on the portion which the bishops transferred to themselves. But not a single regulation was introduced to improve the Cathedral service;—not an additional sermon was provided for, though in half our Cathedrals there is only one on the Sunday;—nothing was done for the improvement of the fabrics; nothing for the management of the Chapter property; nothing, above all, for the revival of its functions as the bishop's council, or for restoring in any shape its ancient connexion with diocesan administration. On all these important points, which might certainly have been considered 'conducive to the efficiency of the Established Church,' the Ecclesiastical Commission and our episcopal legislators were as silent as if capitular action were an acknowledged impossibility, and bishops the infallible all-sufficient administrators of ecclesiastical patronage and discipline.

We submit that we have fully established our assertion, that the measures connected with this Commission were measures of Cathedral spoliation, not of Cathedral reform. The friends of these institutions complain with justice, that instead of using the opportunity to remove abuses and increase their efficiency, Parliament took away their funds, sanctioned all the practices that had brought reproach upon their name, and left them helpless and crippled, as mere pieces of royal or episcopal patronage, till another reform should consign their mutilated trunks to the flames. We have surely a right to demand from the present Commission that the poor remnant of these estates be devoted to the realization of Cathedral efficiency before and exclusive of all other objects whatsoever. Important, nay vital, as is the question of *episcopal extension* we are jealous of even this good being attempted at the expense of the Cathedrals. The large amount of property already alienated to the Ecclesiastical Commission ought to suffice as their contribution to *all* other purposes till their own requirements are fairly satisfied: and so far from expecting any surplus when this is accomplished, our fear is that sufficient revenues do not remain for the moderate supply of imperative wants.

People in general are little aware of the actual cost of Cathedral services. The fabrics alone demand an annual outlay which may startle some of our readers. York Minster has had the large sum of 106,560*l.* spent over it in the last fourteen years, including 71,590*l.* raised by public subscription on the two occasions of fire in 1829 and 1840; besides 5,000*l.* bequeathed for the restoration of the Chapter-house, and another bequest of 2,000*l.* expended on a new peal of bells,

Digitized by Google

The average annual outlay *from Cathedral funds* was nearly 2,500*l.* a-year in these fourteen years: and though the church will be thought at present one of the most perfect in the kingdom, the ordinary repairs and sustentation of the fabric are returned as still amounting to 1,031*l.* per annum, while it is estimated, that to put every part in complete repair, would require the vast outlay of 50,000*l.*! In fact, the building decays faster than it can be restored, and without a large and continual expenditure, would speedily be reduced to ruins. At Canterbury the expenditure in the same period has amounted to 31,960*l.*, or more than 2,000*l.* a-year. A complete reparation of this church was commenced in 1823, and 25,000*l.* has been borrowed from Queen Anne's Bounty to rebuild the north-western tower. The roof is now reported as much decayed, and many years will be required to complete the *necessary* reparations. Durham Cathedral is reported to be 'in very good, substantial repair,' but to have cost in the last fourteen years above 16,000*l.* —a serious sum, remembering that it has mostly been expended in spoiling the church. On Ely has more creditably been expended 28,000*l.*, and 'many parts are still much mutilated 'and defaced.' Wells has cost 12,951*l.*, and 'a very large sum 'still required to put it in proper order: the exterior is, from 'the action of the atmosphere, in a constant state of decompo- 'sition, and discharges from its surface heavy fragments of stone.' Lincoln has cost 21,786*l.*, and has a Fabric-fund averaging 1,604*l.* per annum. In short, it seems to be nowhere safe to assign less than 1,200*l.* or 1,500*l.* a-year to the ordinary sustentation of these ancient buildings, while some of the larger and more ornamented fabrics may require still more. The Cathedrals of the Old Foundation (Wells, we observe, is an exception) have usually a Fabric estate, and often a canon's share in the common estate besides; but the proceeds appear to be in general utterly insufficient to meet the demands. S. Paul's enjoys a special fund amounting to 1,500*l.* per annum, vested in trustees, which, in that recently-erected edifice, may be deemed sufficient. In the churches of the New Foundation the repairs are defrayed out of the common fund, and *pro tanto* diminish the dividend payable to the dean and canons. Under this arrangement their liberal outlay must be considered as redounding very greatly to the credit of the deans and chapters.

Another considerable item, which we regret not to find more particularly distinguished in the Report, is the cost of *choral services*. Besides the endowments of the minor canons, and in some churches lay vicars, the organists, songmen, and chorister boys have to be paid from the common estate; and in York, which is far from exhibiting an efficient choir, this

Digitized by Google

expense is stated at 1,113*l.* per annum. Here, then, is another charge equal to that of the fabric, before we come to the Chapter itself.[1] Then there is the *Library*, and the 'Expenditure for spiritual purposes,' *e.g.*, on chancels, schools, augmentations, &c. of the livings in chapter patronage. On these accounts the outlay has *not* been, in general, such as to do honour to the capitular bodies;[2] and there can be no proper reform unless they are specifically and suitably provided for. When all this indispensable expenditure is duly cared for, we are persuaded there will be no surplus for episcopal extension any further than that object may be subserved by the action of the Chapter itself.

We proceed, then, to the necessities of the capitular body. Here, the first object is, of course, the public worship of Almighty God. On this point we are glad to find the Commissioners speaking with no uncertain sound. They refer to the statutes both of the Old and New Cathedrals, and to the charters of King Henry VIII. to show—

'How carefully provision was made for the great purpose by the Founders and Governors of these Institutions. The members of the several Churches are dedicated for ever to the glory of Almighty God and the perpetual service of His House; *Ecclesia Cathedralis de personis congruis et singulis locis et gradibus suis perimpleatur et decoretur:* it was not a bare sufficiency, but an ample and honourable provision, that was contemplated; so that in each diocese there might be, at least, one place in which the daily Public Worship of God might be maintained in the most solemn manner, in a fabric as worthy of its holy purpose as the highest art of man could frame. In the old Cathedrals, even by the modified form of their later rules, a certain number of the whole body were enjoined to be *always* in residence; and in the new Cathedrals of King Henry VIII., the same rule was laid down by the original statutes. The peculiar manner, also, of the Divine Service is distinctly enjoined—"*singulis diebus laus Dei cantu et jubilatione celebretur.*" '—*Report*, p. xix.

Again,—

'The vast dimensions of the noble fabrics require the services of a *full* and efficient Choir.'—*Ibid.*

---

[1] 'It will be found,' say the Commissioners, 'that in very few Cathedrals, *if any*, is the number of the choir sufficient to provide against the casualties of health; and it does not appear that any Cathedral possesses a special fund for retiring pensions.'

[2] The following are instances which we copy with regret. York, in the last fourteen years, *nothing* beyond individual subscriptions. S. Paul's, 584*l.* in the last ten years. Carlisle, since 1844, 178*l.* Gloucester, since 1826, 2,000*l.* Bristol, 'occasional grants;' and too many more exhibit returns equally meagre. On the other hand, there are some to be mentioned with honour. Canterbury, 5,783*l.* in the last fourteen years: Durham, 36,000*l.* in the last eleven years: Winchester, about 800*l.* per annum in augmentations, and 2,097*l.* in donations, within the last seven years: Manchester, in eight years, 2,652*l.*, contributions to Church Building: Salisbury, in ten years, 6,723*l.*, besides annual augmentations to the amount of 393*l.*: Westminster, since 1833, 27,390*l.*

Digitized by Google

It is hinted that the provisions insisted upon in the statutes of the Reformation, with regard to 'diligent preaching the Word of God,' may not be so important in an age 'when every parish is provided with a minister licensed to preach.' We conceive, however, that Cathedral sermons have still an office and a value of their own; and that at least two on the Lord's day, with others on holy days, and in the Christian seasons, ought to be carefully provided for.[1]

Turning to the actual state of our Cathedrals in regard to Divine service, it appears that morning and afternoon service is celebrated chorally[2] in *all* our Cathedrals on Sundays and holy days, and in *almost* all daily. About half the number have sermons only on the mornings of Sundays and holy days. The Holy Eucharist is celebrated every Sunday and *principal* feast days, in *twelve;* twice in the month, in *one;* and monthly, in *seventeen.* Not a single Cathedral exhibits the practice, which many parish churches have attained to, of Holy Communion *every Sunday and holy day* throughout the year. In seven of the Cathedrals only, are the early matins still observed. Durham has a Sunday evening service with a sermon in the Galilee chapel during the summer. In Winchester the usual morning and afternoon services on Sundays are multiplied into *four*—all choral. The morning service is divided in two at Salisbury and Worcester. Bangor has two Sunday services with sermons in Welsh, in addition to the English choral services; and at Landaff there is a Welsh service with sermon on Wednesday evening. With these exceptions, our Cathedral services are confined to the choir and to the old-fashioned hours, morning and afternoon, at which, on week days at least, there is in the present day the smallest chance of collecting a congregation. The Commissioners ask, with much propriety,—

'Whether a Sunday Evening Service with Sermon in the Nave, would be generally beneficial? whether the division of Services would tend to promote an increase of worshippers? and whether additional Services, not choral, might be instituted with advantage to the inhabitants of Cathedral cities.'—*Report*, p. xx.

They also 'draw attention to the fact that a great part of 'the fabrics of our Cathedrals is at present unused for public 'worship.' And again,—

'To the remarkable difference in the position occupied by the *Precentor* in the Cathedrals of the Old and of the New Foundation: in the former,

[1] An important suggestion is made by the Bishop of Hereford (App. p. 579), that 'A course of lectures might be delivered in the Cathedral to the candidates for Holy Orders, assembled for that purpose some time previous to their examination.'

[2] Llandaff is the only exception.

Digitized by Google

he is one of the principal persons, generally next in rank to the Dean; in the latter, he is one of the Minor Canons, with a very small stipend as Precentor.'—*Ibid.* p. xxi.

These suggestions and remarks point to improvements in the Cathedral services (both as to quantity and quality) which manifestly cannot be effected under the present system of *residence.*

Another object closely connected with the Cathedral services, is the effect that ought to be produced on the parochial churches of the city.

'One of the chief objects in any measure of improvement should be the effective spiritual care of the Cathedral cities. The daily sacrifice of prayer and praise, the holy hymns and anthems of the Cathedral choir, lose much of their value and effect, if they are not, as they were designed to be, the centre and crown of a vigorous and comprehensive church system, diffusing Christian light and joy on all around.'—*Report*, p. xxii.

Nothing could be more truly or nobly said. We need not show how completely this object has been lost sight of in our modern system. The Church is nowhere so little appreciated, Dissent nowhere so rampant,—no, not in the large neglected population of our manufacturing towns,—as in the cities which nestle under the towers of our magnificent Cathedrals, and over whose tranquil streets the clear voice of the prayer-bell is heard twice in every day. One of the greatest blots in the Ecclesiastical Commission is its strange neglect of these cities. The vicarages connected with the Cathedral *endowments*, though at a distance, are recognised as possessing a local claim on its revenues, while the Cathedral city itself has none! This extraordinary conclusion is arrived at, by keeping the eye fixed on the place whence the revenue *arises*, to the exclusion of that for whose benefit it was settled on the Cathedral. Yet, surely, *both* might have been considered as falling under the category of local claims: the city could hardly have been relegated to the same class with all other 'populous places,' had the Cathedral not ceased to be regarded as a spiritual advantage to the locality in which it is situate.

This is, therefore, another result of the low views by which the path of true reform is so frequently crossed. Their operation is in this case peculiarly unfortunate; for the Ecclesiastical Commission, after meeting local claims, deal with other poor benefices in proportion to their *population;* and as Cathedral cities are mostly subdivided into many parishes, though all are in need of augmentation, the population *taken parochially* cannot compare with the great manufacturing towns, which are often comprised in a single 'parish.' Hence, in effect, scarcely any

Digitized by Google

recompense is made to the Cathedral cities under the head of parochial augmentation, for the large revenues abstracted from their capitular establishments.

To meet this palpable defect, it has been proposed to annex some of the canonries to parochial charges in the city, a step already taken at Westminster and Manchester. It may be questioned, however, if this practice could be generally made consistent with the efficiency of the Cathedral itself. Westminster is not a Cathedral church, though the time has long arrived in which it ought to be made one, by the subdivision of the unwieldy diocese of London. Manchester is a parish church, only lately and but imperfectly turned into a Cathedral. We do not see how it is possible to have a Chapter really efficient, both for Cathedral services and diocesan administration, if its members are to be burdened with the additional and all-engrossing labours of extensive parochial cures. How, for instance, can the canons of S. Paul's be expected to satisfy the genuine requirements of their office, while the practice is continued, of filling the stalls with incumbents of parishes, which of themselves demand a college rather than a single pastor for their spiritual oversight. By such appointments the Cathedral is made a mere appendage, at best, to the parish, often only to the personal importance or family aggrandisement of the individual dignitary.

In some cities, where the parishes are not of the same overwhelming population, it is not impossible that partial annexations may be attended with good results: but we should be sorry to see this made the rule. It seems quite enough to keep the *power* of uniting a stall and a parish in the same person when advisable, without permanently annexing the one to the other. The distinguished success which attended the experiment made at Salisbury in the case of the present bishop, is sufficient to show how much may be achieved, even for the city, by canons permanently resident, and devoted exclusively to the proper duties of their Cathedral dignity.

A suggestion, every way more promising for the benefit of the city, is contained in the observation, that—

'By the Statutes of the Old Cathedrals, the Dean had Archidiaconal authority over the parishes of the city, and the rural parishes connected with the Cathedral; and the Archdeacons, besides their duty of general superintendence, were charged to provide for the ministrations of the Church, during the vacancy of a benefice.'—*Report*, p. xxi.

It was to assist in the exercise of this authority that the *subdean* was appointed; not to represent the dean in chapter or in the choir, for of the former he is not always a member,

Digitized by Google

and his duty in the latter is confined to preaching in his turn.[1]

No one desires the system of 'peculiars' to be revived. But to transfer the city, and in some cases, suburban districts from the jurisdiction of the archdeacon to that of the dean, would appear to us one of the best possible methods of at once sustaining and extending the Cathedral influence for good. It is just the measure required to fill up the gulf which in many places yawns so disastrously between the cathedral and the parochial clergy; breeding ostentation in the one, in the other, mortification and envy. We know no one cause to which the prevalence of dissent in Cathedral cities can be attributed with so much probability, as the contrast between the dinner-giving dignitaries and the dinner-needing incumbents. Nothing would more tend to obliterate this unchristian demarcation, than to restore the ancient connexion of the parochial clergy with the dean. At present the rectors and vicars of a Cathedral city, each absolute and neglected in his own little sphere, *totus teres atque rotundus*, may be compared to a bag of marbles emptied on a mahogany table, every one running his course with a supreme indifference towards the rest. And if occasionally collected at some rare and formal banquet in the episcopal palace, they are only the same marbles *put into the bag*. We do not ourselves know a single instance of the bishop exercising that amalgamating influence among the city clergy which might be expected by the uninitiated; and if there are any, the union is in all probability wholly extraneous, perhaps antagonistic, to the *Cathedral*. In general we fear the supervision of the clergy, both episcopal and archidiaconal, is much laxer at the seat of the see than in any other part of the diocese.

It would be every way, then, a most beneficial reform, to restore the ancient decanal jurisdiction. The bishop would gain another 'eye' in the important but neglected centre of his authority; and if only the right men were selected for deaneries, the city clergy would obtain a real friend, adviser and leader, round whom they would quickly gather, and make his Cathedral again the centre and model of their parochial worship.

The remarks already offered go a long way to prove the necessity and advantage of a really resident capitular body. It is further to be remembered, that a variety of other necessary duties cluster round the great centre of Cathedral worship, and put in their several demands on its establishments. The chapter *libraries*, anciently a great portion of the chan-

[1] 'Sub-decani officium est, si decanus abfuerit ecclesiæ vices ejus supplere, curam archidiaconatus in urbe et suburbis gerere.'—*Salisbury Statutes.*

Digitized by Google

cellor's charge, obviously need some better superintendence and management than at present exist, to render the treasures they contain as accessible as they might be made, to the city and diocese at large. The department of *education*, again, whether theological, classical, or elementary, should in all reason and principle, be preserved and developed in every Cathedral establishment; and whatever be the subordinate arrangements, a principal residentiary member, at the least, is required for its superintendence.

Then there is the Fabric itself, each with its particular style of architecture, and all with their glorious array of pillar and arch, and storied windows, and cunning carving of wood and stone, demanding, even for the ordinary repairs, the continual attention of a mind imbued with the principles of their construction, and furnished with some knowledge of the practical appliances required for their sustentation. How is it possible that all these various duties should be adequately cared for by a single residentiary canon, selected for no special aptitude for any one of them, and whirling quickly round in the kaleidoscope of a rotatory residence? The framers of our Cathedral establishments, we have seen, provided a resident dignitary, assisted by a staff of canons, for *each* of these departments. Such were the *quatuor personæ*. 1. The *dean* presiding over the whole establishment, with the spiritual cure of its members, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction throughout the city. 2. The *precentor*, directing the choir with the whole department of Cathedral worship. 3. The *chancellor*, having special charge (along with the corporate seal) of the theological, literary, and educational departments: and 4. The *treasurer*, entrusted with the fabric and sacred utensils, and administering what may be termed the department of *ecclesiastical architecture and art*. With *less* than these four dignitaries, or their equivalents, *permanently* resident, it is impossible to carry out the idea of a Cathedral at all. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners, however, with their customary misapprehension of Cathedral requisites, have swept away the endowments of precentor, chancellor, and treasurer altogether; and a proposition is now broached to abolish the dean, and transfer his duties to the bishop. We are surprised that the Cathedral Commissioners should have entertained this suggestion, even so far as to refer it for the consideration of the several bishops. The Bishop of Lichfield disposes of it with this brief common-sense observation:—

'I am not aware of any advantage likely to result from "uniting the offices of Bishop and Dean." I am sure the Bishops, at least generally, have enough to do in their proper sphere, without having the burden of another office laid upon them.'—*Appendix*, p. 582.

Digitized by Google

The Bishop of Exeter more elaborately meets it in this way:—

'If it be meant to *destroy the corporate character* of the Chapter, and to substitute a *collegium presbyterorum cui præsit episcopus*, it would be simply a return to primitive practice, on the adaptation of which to the existing state of things in our own Church, I would crave permission to decline at present offering an opinion. I am very far from wishing to imply any condemnation of *such* a proposal. I only presume to suggest that it involves considerations too many and too grave to be dealt with in a cursory paper like this. On the other hand, if it be intended to make the Bishop the head of the capitular corporation, the proposal would seem to me to be open to very serious objections; one only of which it may be deemed sufficient to mention,—namely, that the effect of such a measure would manifestly be to heap another class of onerous duties and occupations on the already overladen shoulders of the Bishop.'—*Appendix*, p. 572.

It must be obvious indeed, as the Bishop of Llandaff observes:—'That the union of the two offices would be impossible,' if the residence and other functions of the dean are to be retained on the footing already admitted to be essential to Cathedral efficiency. We may, therefore, dismiss this suggestion as one of revolution rather than reform.[1]

The time is now come when the Church and the country must decide once for all, whether they choose to retain their Cathedrals or not. If we make up our minds to sacrifice these precious legacies to considerations of economy, or the demands of other portions of the Church's system, we had better be consistent and suppress the Chapters altogether. It would be preferable to pull down the edifices, rather than shame their magnificent proportions, and expose our own hollowness, by keeping up a melancholy, mutilated, fragment of establishments, that once had a meaning and a place in the service of God. A scanty, scrambling band of choristers and songmen, dotting rather than occupying the spacious choir, and with ill-sustained efforts startling, not wakening, the echoes of the majestic pile,—a single minor canon, drearily plodding through matins, and lessons, and litany,—a long row of empty stalls, finished off at the curtained extremity by a solitary dignitary trying to present the majesty of an absent Chapter in the pomp of his personal bearing, or *acting* the precentor by beating time to the anthem,—these are really not worth preserving at any price. Better give up a struggle that neither honours God nor benefits mankind, and subside into a form of worship which we can more honestly

[1] The proposal is countenanced by the Bishops of Ripon, S. David's, and Manchester; but the first refers only to his own Cathedral, which is a parish church, and suffering under a *plethora* of newly-erected, and little-valued Cathedral dignitaries. The second leans to the idea of a *suffragan* bishop as dean; and the last is hardly an authority on this, or any other, point. Perhaps the *Dean* of Manchester might be equally sceptical on the value of the bishop!

Digitized by Google

appreciate. If, on the other hand, these homes of ancient piety are still to be upheld, let them be rendered in some degree worthy of their purpose, and of Him to whose service they are consecrated. Let the Church of England be no longer saddled with the reproach of not understanding the distinguishing features of her own polity. We ask for no 'meretricious display,' no decorative arts, no intricate music, no unusual gestures, ceremonies, or processions; we only want the English worship solemnized in harmony with its own standard, and our Cathedral establishments made what they profess to be.

We will proceed to indicate some of the details in which we conceive this object may yet, to a great extent, be accomplished.

The primary consideration is the *constitution of the residentiary body;* for a *body* is clearly indispensable; and here we would begin (as already suggested) by recalling the *quatuor personæ* into *joint and continuous residence.* If no other residentiaries were added, a precentor, chancellor, and treasurer, permanently administering their respective departments, would be a very happy exchange for the four partially residentiary canons, who constitute the present establishment. But in the larger Cathedrals, at least three canons should be in continuous residence along with the dignitaries, making seven in all. Crippled as we now are for pecuniary means, it might not be necessary to insist on this establishment in the smaller churches, where the *quatuor personæ,* together with the minor canons, might probably suffice. It is essential, however, that in the metropolitical churches of Canterbury and York, in S. Paul's, Westminster Abbey, Durham, Ely, Manchester, and wherever else the funds are still available, the establishments should be placed on a scale which we need not blush to exhibit to the foreigners who now visit us from so many parts of the world. Considering the limited musical capacities of our nation, it might be wiser to select some seven or eight of the largest Cathedrals for the more complete constitution, and let the others be content with a secondary, though consistent and effective, scale of establishments.

Whether any of the residentiary body should be permitted to hold a benefice *in the city,* would depend entirely on local circumstances. One of the greatest mistakes of our Cathedral reformers hitherto, has been to impose a Procrustean standard on churches and cities of widely different dimensions. We regard the Four we have named as the minimum requisite in *every* see, in order to realize the true idea of a Cathedral church; but we would leave other points to be determined by local requisites, and personal qualifications. It might be left open, then, so far as legislation is concerned, to the precentor, chancellor, and treasurer, as it is at present to the dean, to hold a benefice *in the Cathedral city;*

Digitized by Google

and the whole Chapter, together with the visitor, might determine in each particular instance, whether such an arrangement be desirable; in other words, the dignitary should be required to obtain the consent of the bishop and the Chapter before institution to a benefice.

Having thus settled the residentiary body, all the other canons might be placed in the position belonging of ancient right to the non-resident members of the Old Foundations; that is, all should be members of the Chapter, with the right of officiating in the services of the Cathedral as often as they find opportunity, and *bound* also, as at present, to take their turns in the preaching. We should further propose, that while the residentiaries might hold intermediate Chapters (with due notice) for the transaction of pressing affairs, all the ordinary business, *including the exercise of patronage*, the management of the property, and the regulations for Divine service, should be transacted only at *Quarterly* Chapters, which the non-resident canons should be bound to attend, unless prevented by illness, or other cause to be approved by the dean. By this means the Cathedral would enjoy the counsel of all its members, and be enabled to assemble them on every occasion of more than ordinary solemnity. Some of these canons might be accidentally, though not necessarily, resident in the Cathedral city, as parochial clergymen or otherwise. The archdeacons of the diocese should always be among their number; so might diocesan inspectors and rural deans, at the discretion of the bishop, and according to the materials at his disposal. The number of such stalls, therefore, should be considerable, though not of necessity uniform in every church. In the Cathedrals of the Old Foundation, the existing number might remain. In those of the New, the 'honorary canons,' who have now no proper Cathedral function, should be taken into the Chapter on the same footing with the non-resident members in the others. The chief difficulty, with regard to such members of Chapters, is the *financial one*. We agree with the Bishop of Hereford in the importance of restoring—

> 'The Prebendaries (or Honorary Canons as they now are, even where the name of Prebendary is still preserved, as at Hereford,[1]) to some portion at least of that interest which they formerly possessed in the Cathedral funds, and of which recent legislation has deprived them.'—*Appendix*, p. 579.

[1] As some confusion seems to exist with regard to these names, it may be well to remind the reader, that 'honorary canons,' properly speaking, exist only in the Cathedrals of the *New* Foundation; where they were established by the 3 and 4 Vic. c. 113. In the old Cathedrals the non-resident stalls are retained without emoluments, and so far are 'honorary,' but the Act reserves to them all the other rights and privileges of their predecessors. Such members were no doubt originally all

Digitized by Google

It is certainly unjust to require clergymen to travel to the Cathedral in order to preach, and *à fortiori* to attend the Chapter, without at least reimbursing their expenses. Bishop Hampden proposes a payment out of the common fund, as in the case of the University preachers at Oxford. A better mode might be a small endowment to each stall, subject to a fine for every occasion of non-attendance. There is no reason why after securing to each stall some moderate endowment, just enough to recognise the position and defray its necessary expenditure, *stipends* should not be paid out of the common fund to particular canons, varying with the offices they might hold (if any) in connexion with the Chapter, such as theological professors, school inspectors, or in some cases, rural deans. This is matter of detail, and must be regulated by the amount of money disposable for the purpose. The archdeacons have already an official endowment, unconnected with residence at the Cathedral; and if the decanal jurisdiction were restored over the city, the argument for their being called into residence would be done away.

Let us now recapitulate the constitution, which a perusal of the mass of information and suggestions contained in the Report and Appendix, together with some personal acquaintance with the details both of Cathedral and parochial work, have led us to suggest as best adapted to present exigencies and the amount of funds still available.

i. The Dean, presiding over the whole Cathedral Establishment and Chapter, with archidiaconal jurisdiction in the city.

ii. The Precentor, charged with the details of the choir, the whole celebration of Cathedral worship, and the religious, moral, and musical training of the chorister boys.

iii. The Chancellor, charged with the departments of theology, literature, and education; including special lectures in the Cathedral pulpit, the care of the library, and the superintendence of the grammar-school. This dignitary might, in some places, be the principal of a theological college.

iv. The Treasurer, specially superintending the architectural and artistic repairs and restoration of the fabric.

---

canons; but as that word denotes a *Member of Chapter*, it came in time to be applied to the residentiaries only, while the others were distinguished by the appellation of Prebendaries, *i. e.* persons enjoying a *præbenda* in the Church. In the official documents both terms are employed, and strictly speaking, the dignitary is a canon of the Cathedral and prebendary of the particular stall; but when the seat in chapter had been lost, Prebendary became the most usual designation. At York, where the place in Chapter was retained, they were called indifferently by either appellation, but now, since the *præbenda* has been lost, the title of *Canon*, we observe, is usually and most properly borne.

Digitized by Google

pounded by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, acquiesced in by the episcopal bench, and sanctioned by Parliament. They have accepted, as a *fait accompli*, the disgraceful mutilation of Cathedral institutions effected by superior authority, and tried to patch up the remnants for their own advantage. Finding both the property and the trusts, 'recognised by their statutes,' forcibly interfered with, and the remnants spared only as 'prizes' for the benefits of the individual residentiaries, they have turned them to the best account, by making over their encumbered estates to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, in return for an arrangement more beneficial to themselves and their successors. Several of the bishops have done the same, and in each case the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, including the whole episcopal bench, have been the other party to the bargain. In all such transfers of property, both bishops and Chapters shift from their own shoulders and those of their successors many most 'important functions,' originally annexed to their endowments. But when these functions have been long neglected by common consent, and Church reformers, instead of seeking to revive them, set up the Ecclesiastical Commission to complete their legal extinction, why are these two Chapters to be blamed for not being wiser or more virtuous than the rest of their generation?

In a higher point of view these transactions are in every case ruinous and indefensible. If the Cathedral Commissioners would assume the office of exposing and reforming them with an impartial hand, we should be the last to deprecate their censures, however weighty.

On turning to the account given by the Chapter of York in the Appendix, we find it stated that the sum for which their common estate has been thus 'commuted' is 4,410*l.* per annum, and that the property made over to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners in return is '*probably three-fold*' *the value*. So that here we have a corporate body, in order to 'secure a more steady average revenue,' *sacrificing two-thirds of the trust estate*, to the pecuniary advantage of the trustees! But this is not all. The Chapter proceeds, with a candour perfectly suicidal, to represent,—

'That the alienation of so great a mass of property, lying chiefly in the county of York, and connected with a great number of poor livings now left without claims on the bounty of the members of the capitular body, appears to form a just ground of expectation that *special* consideration should be paid by those who now hold the property to *the wants of the cures immediately connected therewith*.'—*Appendix*, p. 28.

Now this is too bad. In answer to the question, 'What is the 'amount of aid afforded by the Chapter from its corporate reve-

Digitized by Google

'nues for spiritual objects in the diocese, or in parishes connected 'with the capitular body, or for religious purposes generally?' the Chapter of York reply, 'Members of Chapter have individually contributed as they thought proper to these purposes.' That is to say, they have done as all other clergymen and Christians do—bestowed their individual and personal bounty 'as they thought proper;' but *nothing* has been given out of the corporate revenue;—*nothing* to meet the claim of right, which they wish to establish against the Commissioners who now hold the property. The Dean and Chapter of Durham answer the same question by exhibiting a schedule of augmentations, occupying two folio pages, and amounting in fee to nearly 150,000*l.* At York it is thought enough for individuals to contribute 'as they think proper,' and as a matter of personal '*bounty*.' We have not yet, however, reached the worst. The Dean and Chapter proceed to argue that these lands and livings involve a solemn trust. 'A bar,' they say, 'ought to be put to the '*diversion of any funds anciently and legally appropriated* to 'maintaining' the fabrics and services of the several parishes. Yet they have themselves voluntarily, and for their own pecuniary advantage, 'diverted' this whole property to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners! They insist, again, on the right of their fabric to retain its sixth share in the future improvement of this estate, as it would, unquestionably, have done had it remained with themselves. These are their words:—

'The Dean and Chapter of York *endeavoured* to insist that the trust funds here referred to should be as scrupulously respected by those into whose hands it has passed, as it would have been by the Court of Chancery; but the commutation, as above described, of their common estates, WHICH INCLUDE THE TRUST FUND, *has taken place without a guarantee on this point!*'—*Appendix*, p. 28.

Taken place, indeed! By what means? By the voluntary act of the Chapter, who, finding that the Commissioners would not, or could not, give the guarantee they asked for, handed over their estate (*trust fund included*) without it, being solely intent on the advantage or convenience to *themselves* of 'a more steady average income.' And then they come with an appeal to the Cathedral Commissioners, 'to show the importance of rigorously 'retaining such funds in a just application to their original 'purposes!!'

We are as anxious as the Cathedral Commissioners can be to have all such matters thoroughly investigated; but they indicate no channel for conducting the inquiry which they have declined for themselves, and we can only hope that Parliament will interpose to cancel these transactions, or if it be too late for that, to prevent any more such 'commutations.'

Digitized by Google

We have now endeavoured to trace the leading features, and to show the feasibility of a genuine measure of Cathedral reform. We have laid down distinctly, we hope, but of course only in general terms, some outlines of what a Cathedral establishment may yet be made. To fill in the sketch with the several important functions it might discharge, both in the city and the diocese, is more than can be attempted in a single review.

But our task would be too imperfectly executed, if we did not offer some remarks on the mode of selecting the individuals to be entrusted with capitular duties. This has hitherto been treated as a matter of mere *patronage;* exercised in most Cathedrals by the bishop of the diocese, in some few by the Crown or the Lord Chancellor, and in others by the majority of the Chapter. At York the appointment of the *canons* was with the Archbishop; while the Dean, as we have seen, had obtained the privilege of nominating out of their number the four who were to be joined with himself as *residentiaries.* The recent legislation abrogates all these privileges on the part of deans and chapters, and vests the patronage in all cases, saving the rights of the Crown, in the bishop of the diocese. It is now suggested that the Crown and the Lord Chancellor, instead of appointing to all the stalls in particular Cathedrals, should present to one or two in several churches, and let the diocesan fill the remainder. This suggestion obviously and naturally proceeds from the bishops whose Cathedrals are at present *wholly* in State patronage, and it would doubtless be well to adopt it; but there can be no greater mistake than to suppose that any real improvement will ensue from a mere change of patrons, unaccompanied by new guarantees for the right exercise of the trust. Regarded simply as patrons, we know no reason for preferring bishops to deans and chapters, or ecclesiastics to laymen. Either class are perfectly competent to make fit appointments if they choose; and we fear that all have pretty equally exhibited their liability to be influenced otherwise through nepotism, private favour, or political interest. In theory, perhaps, the system still obtaining at York is as good as any, and certainly is not likely to be improved by centring the patronage absolutely in the archbishop. Again, the clergy certainly have little reason for wishing to abolish the patronage of the Crown; since Premiers and Chancellors are not all to be measured by the standards of Lord John Russell and Lord Cranworth; and by vesting some appointments in Ministers of State, a door is opened to many good men, who have not the fortune to occupy the first place in the episcopal favour. The main thing is to induce patrons, whoever they may be, to select

Digitized by Google

the right men, or at all events to restrain them from selecting those who are notoriously the wrong men, for Cathedral preferment.

The course of late pursued with this object in view has been to reduce the emoluments below the acceptance of the *very* influential class, and we are far from denying that some advantage may have attended this ingenious device. In the affairs of the world it is considered the best policy, when work is required to be well done, to pay for it accordingly. In the Church it has been found, that duty is more carefully attended to in proportion as its just remuneration is withdrawn.

It must not be forgotten, however, that the residentiary body is not *all* that is required for the service of the Cathedral. We can hardly expect, that even with three canons in addition to the dignitaries, the aid of *vicars choral* can be dispensed with; while in the Cathedrals of the second class, where none but the dignitaries would be left in residence, this lower order must supply assistance of a more general kind. It would be necessary, therefore, to retain perhaps *three* minor canons in every Cathedral, who must have residences and suitable incomes provided from their own, or the superior, foundation, so as to be under no necessity of eking out a subsistence by parochial or scholastic labours. Their time must be devoted exclusively to the Cathedral; and genuine skill, both in the science and practice of chanting, with superior voices, should be strictly insisted upon. For these requirements, a less remuneration than 250*l.* per annum cannot well be offered.

The *lay* members of the Foundation also are to be considered. These are almost everywhere reduced below the number essential to the efficiency of a choral service, besides being often wretchedly paid, and, as the necessary consequence, miserably qualified for their important function. At Durham, the lay-vicars are ten in number, and share 1,147*l.* amongst them. At York, they have fourteen songmen, but only *six* bound to *daily* attendance, and these *six* have but 45*l.* a-year each. Both of these Cathedrals have ten choristers, six of whom at York get but 8*l.* a-year, and the others 12*l.* and 14*l.*; while at Durham all under twelve years of age receive 17*l.* a-year, and the older boys 27*l.* A first-class Cathedral ought to have *twelve* men and sixteen or twenty boys, at the Durham rate of allowance; and about 200*l.* per annum should be set aside as a *superannuation* fund. Cathedrals of the second class might be content with half this establishment; and both classes might be able, when their establishments were settled on a respectable and remunerative scale, to increase their force by the employment of unpaid *probationers*. The idea of relying on

Digitized by Google

voluntary assistance further than this, is considered by almost all the precentors and organists perfectly visionary.

The daily service, the schools, the fabric, and other objects more immediately connected with the Cathedral locality, being thus attended to, it remains to consider the capitular body in its *corporate* character, and more particularly in its relations to the bishop and the diocese.

Supposing then a Chapter thus constituted of a residentiary body, duly qualified for Cathedral duties, and exclusively devoted to their performance, with a number of non-residentiary canons variously occupied in the diocese, and all assembled together at quarterly meetings, we might hope to restore with some effect its ancient character as the council of the Bishop in the administration of the diocese. *Legislative* acts demand the authority of a diocesan or provincial synod; but it is the *executive*, more than the legislative, function that needs to be organized and strengthened among ourselves. To this end the capitular council might prove an organ of inestimable advantage. The non-resident canons would often comprehend the majority of the rural deans, or the latter might be associated with the Chapter at its conciliary meetings. Though the Cathedral would require its Quarterly Chapters, it might suffice to hold the council *half-yearly*. On these occasions the bishop should always preside in person; and the rural deans should invariably assemble their local Chapters a month before, so as to enable any question that may arise among the clergy to be referred for the consideration of the capitular council. Such an organization, reaching direct from the centre to every part of the diocese, would at once infuse a new life into all its members. By thus simply putting 'into gear' the existing machinery of the Church, we should again unite the bishop, the Cathedral chapter, and the parochial clergy in one harmonious whole; and we must defy the experience of all mankind, in all affairs, to suppose that such a concentration of purpose would not be attended with the most beneficial and practical results.

Certain it is that relations such as these formed a prominent feature in the original constitution of our Cathedral institutions, and were foremost among the objects contemplated in their retention at the Reformation. The Report we are reviewing furnishes some valuable extracts to this effect from the writings both of ancient and modern canonists—of foreign as well as English divines. Thus Binterim, in his *Christ Katholische Kirche*,—

'During the lifetime, and still more on the death of the bishop, the Cathedral chapter must take a part in the administration of affairs in the diocese. The most important concerns (according to the rules of the canon

Digitized by Google

law) shall not be undertaken by the bishop without consultation with the Chapter. The whole Chapter has, consequently, relations with the diocese. From this Chapter certain members must be chosen to examine the clerks applying for ordination, and the priests as to their care for the souls under their charge. Others must have different offices, which may have an influence either on the clergy or laity of the diocese. Every member shall, by virtue of his office, be to the diocese as a shining light and a strengthening salt.'—*Report*, p. lv.

Our own bishop Scambler (of Peterborough and Norwich), who himself had been prebendary both of York and Westminster, writes to Queen Elizabeth, A.D. 1582:—

'That kind of foundation implieth alway a society of learned men, staied and grounded in all parts of religion, apt to preach the Gospel and convince errors and heresies, which in the singleness of opinion, where particular men over particular churches as pastors are set within the diocese where it is chief, may happen to arise: and *further, to assist the bishop, the head of the diocese, in all godly and wholesome consultations*, inasmuch that the Cathedral church ought to be, as it were, the oracle of the whole diocese, and a light unto all places lying near it.'—*Ibid.*

Bishop Stillingfleet, again, (in his 'Ecclesiastical Cases,' vol. ii. p. 564—8) asserts the same, both from the history of our Church and 'that which is far more material, our common *law*; it is 'said that the dean and chapter were appointed as a council to 'the bishop, with whom he is to consult in cases of difficulty.' And Lord Bacon reckons, 'the sole exercise of authority, one of 'the two circumstances in the administration of bishops wherein 'he could never be satisfied.' 'The greatest kings and monarchs,' (he says) 'have their councils. There is no temporal 'court in England where the authority rests in one person. 'Surely, one may suppose, that from the beginning it was not 'thus, and that the deans and chapters were councils about 'the sees and chairs of bishops at the first, and were to them 'a presbytery or consistory, and intermeddled, not only in the 'disposing of their revenues and endowments, but much more 'in ecclesiastical jurisdiction.'—P. lvii.

When statements of this kind are submitted to Her Most Gracious Majesty under the hands and seals of the two archbishops, the dean of the arches, and a vice-chancellor,[1] we may hope that we have outlived that unreasoning jealousy of synodical action, which, natural as it was in the Hanoverian prelates, who knew themselves to be odious to the bulk of the clergy and the Church, is now the most cruel injustice a bishop can perpetrate against himself and his diocese. No prelacy in the world (save, *perhaps*, the pope's) has become so autocratical as the English episcopate; consequently, no office in Church or

[1] The signatures to the Report are:—J. B. Cantuar., T. Ebor., Blandford, Harrowby, C. J. London, S. Oxon., H. Montagu Villiers, J. Dodson, J. Patteson, William Page Wood, Chr. Wordsworth, W. F. Hook, and William Selwyn.

Digitized by Google

State is more exposed to the perils of *isolation*, which—at all times the Nemesis of arbitrary power—is to a *Church* the angel of death. It is through having been involved in the cold shadow of this terrible cloud, that our Cathedrals have suffered, and still suffer, both from without and within. To be safe themselves, they must vindicate their rightful share in the general sympathies;—they must insist on discharging their proper function in the circulation of the living tide that animates the Church's heart. And if in the honourable struggle for a redintegration of their relations with the Church and the diocese, they draw back the bishops with them, rendering them, in spite of their fears, the centres of a mighty but well-ordered action, they will return good for evil, and prove the deep practical wisdom of those who planted the English episcopate on a Cathedral platform.

We have now only to express our hope, that the Cathedral Commissioners will not be diverted from the great and practical objects of capitular endowments by any pedantic or *amateur* propositions. To accomplish a great practical reform, they must consider present feelings, wants, and habits, in conjunction with ancient immoveable principles. Any attempt to reduce Cathedral dignitaries to 'primitive poverty,'—to saddle them with conflicting duties,—or to require a mode of life which is foreign to the national habits of English society, would only serve to increase their *isolation*, and so precipitate their suppression. We believe that a sound thorough reform is now feasible, if the recommendations we are awaiting shall be found simple, bold, and consistent. But if the Commissioners should unhappily resort to petty half-measures, or lose themselves in speculative eccentric innovations, their labours will be thrown away, and reformers of another spirit will quickly assume the lead. We comfort ourselves with the hope, that the former of these courses will be adopted, and, for which object, the Commissioners desire the prayers of Her Majesty and the whole Church, that they may be enabled to suggest a noble scheme, which 'may 'tend to make our Cathedral churches once more, *as they were* '*originally*, integral and effective parts of our ecclesiastical orga-'nization, fitted to promote to the utmost the public worship of 'ALMIGHTY GOD, and to maintain and extend that holy faith of 'CHRIST our Saviour, which by their means was first propagated 'and established in this country.'

Since the foregoing pages were in type, we have perused the publication by the Bishop of Salisbury, the title of which is prefixed to this article. Perhaps there is no individual now living better qualified than his Lordship to suggest a sound

Digitized by Google

practical measure of Cathedral Reform, and it is much to be regretted he was not included in the Capitular Commission. We are strongly confirmed in the views arrived at from our acquaintance with Cathedrals, in many respects differently circumstanced from that of Salisbury, to find so great an authority substantially agreed with ourselves. The Bishop states the two great principles on which the work of a Cathedral system depends, to be

'*The constant residence of the dean and canons*, and *the discharge of their proper functions by the members of the large Chapter.*'—P. 5.

Like us he would restore that distribution of definite duties among the residentiary body which the founders had in view in the establishment of the *quatuor personæ*, while he suggests a variety of modern duties which might (in his own city) be similarly assigned in addition:—such as the head-mastership of the Grammar-school to the chancellor; the secretaryship of the Board of Education and the chaplaincy to the Training-school, to the treasurer; the parochial charge of a district to be annexed to the Cathedral, to the precentor; and a vicarage in the city, to a residentiary canon. These are matters of detail to be settled by the Deans and Chapters themselves with the approval of the bishop. All that legislation can accomplish is the right constitution of the corporate body, with the powers and restrictions requisite to its efficiency.

The Bishop of Salisbury thinks that in his Cathedral the establishment might consist of *one* residentiary canon in addition to the four dignitaries, and *four* vicars-choral always resident; one of whom should act as curate of the Cathedral district under the precentor, another as lecturer at the Grammar and Training-schools, a third, as chaplain to the city workhouse, and secretary of the elementary and Infant-schools, and the fourth as librarian. The vicars, he thinks, should not form, as at present, a distinct corporation, but surrender their property and receive fixed incomes regularly paid by the Dean and Chapter. Of lay-vicars he recommends twelve in place of six, and sixteen choristers instead of eight; the former with respectable stipends, the latter, as at present, *boarded*, *educated*, and *apprenticed* by the Chapter.

These suggestions, with a number of other details, having been embodied in a regular plan, were *unanimously* approved by the Dean and Chapter of Salisbury, and submitted, with the full concurrence of the late Bishop Denison, to the Cathedral Commissioners. If any doubt could exist of the great advantages to be derived to the Church at large from the adoption of

Digitized by Google

such a reform, it must be dispelled by a simple perusal of the Bishop's List of 'principles attempted to be realized.'

'1. The furtherance of education in all its branches.
'2. The worthy celebration of Divine Worship.
'3. The constant residence of the Dean and Canons at their Cathedral.
'4. Justice to those vicarages of which the Dean and Chapter are Rectors.
'5. Liberal contributions to charities in those parishes where the Dean and Chapter have any property.
'6. The proper endowment of parochial cures in Cathedral cities.
'7. The payment of proper stipends to all persons connected with the Cathedrals, and so the abolition of the system of fees.
'8. The restoration of the dignitaries and prebendaries to their legitimate functions.
'9. The connexion of districts with Cathedrals.
'10. The greater frequency of more varied and popular services.
'11. The revival of discipline in the Cathedral body, by removing the trammels which fetter both the relation of the visitor to the Dean and Chapter, and all the other relations of authority statutably and necessarily existing in such a society.'—P. 4.

In this list—indeed in the whole scheme suggested in the pamphlet—there is one important omission. No reference whatever is made to the functions of the Chapter *as council to the Bishop.* His Lordship states with great force the importance of preserving the non-residentiary canons to supply the requisite connexion between the residentiary body and the diocese at large. He proposes to summon this large Chapter annually at Pentecost (according to a former custom at Salisbury) to audit the Cathedral accounts, and hear appeals on all matters connected with the Chapter, its officers and schools; but he is unaccountably silent with respect to any duties of a conciliatory character. On this point, therefore, we must decidedly prefer the more extended action suggested in our previous remarks.

It is satisfactory to find that no question is made in this pamphlet, that all the important objects in view may be achieved by an improved management of the property still remaining in the Cathedral corporations. The suggestions of Bishop Denison, concurred in by his successor, is that these estates should be transferred *for a time* to a central Commission constituted for this express purpose. By such an arrangement all the advantage would be derived which the Chapters of York and Carlisle proposed to secure in their recent commutation with the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, while the improved value of the property, when disencumbered of its leases, would be reserved to accomplish the noble reforms we have endeavoured to indicate, instead of being melted down in the voracious crucible of that very unsatisfactory Commission.

Digitized by Google

ART. IV.—1. *An Inquiry into the Principles of Church-authority; or, Reasons for recalling my Subscription to the Royal Supremacy. By* R. I. WILBERFORCE, M.A. London: Longmans. 1854. Pp. 284.

2. *Papal Supremacy tested by Antiquity. By the late* Rev. JAMES MEYRICK, M.A. London: Longmans. 1855. Pp. 84.

THESE two books were being written, it appears, by their respective authors about the same time. They go over the same ground, so far as the main subject in hand is concerned, and arrive at very different conclusions. We have placed them together at the head of our article, because we shall have to contrast the statements made by the two writers on several points. But our present work is with Mr. Wilberforce.

There is nothing new in the 'Inquiry' before us except its name. We doubt if there is a single fact or a single thought contained in its pages which has not previously appeared in one or the other of Mr. Allies' two works on the same subject. Indeed the whole book may be said to be an expansion of the Preface to Mr. Allies' 'See of St. Peter.' At the same time, though Mr. Wilberforce has brought forward no new facts, and has discovered no new principle to give an altered complexion to facts previously known, his present book is by no means deficient in merits of its own. It is excellently arranged. A theory is put forward, and facts are marshalled in such a way as to fit in with the theory as well as is possible. Whether this has been done fairly or unfairly, whether counterbalancing facts have been duly noticed or omitted, whether the facts which are selected have been stated with all their qualifying circumstances, or whether they have been so strung together as to lead a reader to draw a conclusion from them different from that which in themselves they would naturally suggest, are points which we propose presently to consider.

Besides the merit of arrangement, Mr. Wilberforce has also the advantage over Mr. Allies in good-temper. Mr. Allies was full of his feelings as 'a free man,' of the 'infamy,' 'degradation,' 'naked infidelity' of Anglicanism; the 'virus of the Reformation' was 'flagrant;' and the English Church was a 'hideous phantom.' Nothing of this sort is found in Mr. Wilberforce. There is one quiet hit at Dr. Wordsworth (p. 17) and another at the Queen (p. 279): otherwise personalities are avoided. Again, Mr. Allies began by showing his teeth in the first page, and by setting his reader as 'a Protestant' at the extremest point of opposition to himself the 'Catholic.' More wisely Mr. Wilberforce begins with what his reader is likely to hold with himself,—'You 'believe in the Church—you believe that the Church hath

Digitized by Google

'authority in controversies of faith—you believe the Episcopate 'to be the medium of Church authority—you think a Hierarchy 'useful—you don't object to acknowledging a certain kind of 'Primacy—won't you hold the Supremacy?' This is more telling than Mr. Allies' fashion; not that one way or the other way ought in reason to have influence with a man of clear thought; but we know that we are all more disposed to go along with one who takes us for a part of the journey in the direction in which we are desirous of travelling, and we are less likely to mark the slight divergence of his and our path at the outset than when it is prominently brought before us, that the spots to which they lead are thousands of miles apart.

Setting out on this principle, Mr. Wilberforce avoids startling his reader in his first chapters. His weapon here is exaggeration. For example, it is true that the Church is not 'a mere congeries of individuals,' and that it does 'possess a collective character;' but to illustrate this Mr. Wilberforce uses a metaphor which will naturally lead the mind to accept the doctrine of development: 'By a wall is meant a certain arrangement of 'bricks, which, when united, are nothing more than bricks still, 'but a tree is not merely a congeries of ligneous particles, but 'implies the presence of a certain principle of life which com-'bines them into a collective whole' (p. 2). Mr. Wilberforce's first proposition should not be established on a metaphor which does not only suggest the idea which is needed, but adds to it another idea to which Mr. Wilberforce finds it necessary to have recourse in his after pages (p. 99, &c.). Again—as specimens of the same method—in the second, third, and fourth chapters we find propositions laid down and elaborately proved, with which we heartily agree, but before Mr. Wilberforce leaves them he pushes them on into being something quite different from what they were when he started with them. For example, because we hold with Mr. Wilberforce that 'the Church hath authority in controversies of faith' (p. 7), and that 'the Church is a witness to truth, and also that in matters of conscience its authorities have a claim to attention' (p. 8), we are not therefore bound to cast aside all those other means of arriving at truth which a greater than Mr. Wilberforce has enumerated, viz. Holy Scripture, the existing Church, Tradition, Catholicity, Learning, Antiquity, the National faith, Common sense, natural Perception of right and wrong, the Affections, the Imagination, Reason, and the like[1]. Yet this is involved in the assertion which we

[1] Prophetical Office of the Church, p. 158. 'Most men try to dispense with one or other of these divine informants; and for this reason,—because it is difficult to combine them. The lights they furnish, coming from various quarters, cast separate shadows, and partially intercept each other; and it is pleasanter to walk without doubt and without shade, than to have to choose what is best and safest. The Romanist would simplify matters by removing Reason, Scripture, and Anti-

Digitized by Google

arrive at in p. 37, that the principle on which the belief in Church authority depends is 'that the Divine Spirit, which has its dwelling in the collective body,' (he means, as the context shows, '*qua* dwelling in the collective body') 'is our *sole* guide in the things of God.' We can contemplate the union in one person of the two characters of a reasonable and reasoning individual Christian and a deferential Churchman.

Again, we can believe that it is to the early Church that we owe the settlement of the canon of Holy Scripture, and we can feel assured, upon that evidence of probability which is by God's dispensation our only guide except in matters of science and revelation, that the canon there fixed, as distinct from that accepted at Trent or elsewhere, is the true canon, and yet we need not see in this act a proof of the inspiration of the Church, and then upon the inspiration thus proved, build up the theory of infallibility, 'that gift of spiritual discernment which had 'dwelt originally in the person of our Lord, and had been 'bestowed upon the Apostles' (p. 98). The account left us by Eusebius is entirely inconsistent with the theory that the Church settled the canon by a spiritual discernment and distinctly inspired judgment, rather than because it was 'nearer to the age of the Apostles than ourselves' (p. 28). Mr. Wilberforce builds a great deal on this act of the Church, but there are two objections to his view. The first is the historical evidence, which is to be found throughout the pages of Eusebius, that the early Christians used the ordinary rules of criticism and inquiry in making up their minds as to what were and what were not inspired books. And the second difficulty is that, supposing Mr. Wilberforce's foundation true, still he could not build upon it the doctrine of infallible discrimination *in dogma*, but *in matters of fact*, which proves too much, for he rejects the opinion 'that the Holy Ghost has been given to the Church to enable 'her to judge about matters of fact' (p. 33).

Once more, we can believe that it was quite right that eating of blood should be allowed, and that the observance of the Jewish law should be prohibited, in the time of S. Augustine, without being driven to the conclusion, that the Church had power to abrogate Apostolic decrees handed down in Scripture, and that the

quity, and depending mainly upon Church authority; the Calvinist relies on Reason, Scripture, and Criticism, to the disparagement of the Moral sense, the Church, Tradition, and Antiquity; the Latitudinarian relies on Reason, with Scripture in subordination; the Mystic on the feelings and affections, or what is commonly called the heart; the l'olitician takes the national faith as sufficient, and cares for little else; the man of the world acts by common sense, which is the oracle of the careless; the Popular Religionist considers the authorized version of Scripture to be all in all. But the true Catholic Christian is he who takes what God has given him, be it greater or less; despises not the lesser because he has received the greater, yet puts it not before the greater, but uses all duly and to God's glory.'—P. 160.

Digitized by Google

principle on which she possessed this power was, that her authority was equal to that of the Apostles. We can believe that such decrees were intended to be temporary, and that when the necessity for them ceased they thereupon ceased, without equalizing the power of those who determined that the necessity for them was now passed with that of the holy Apostles who instituted them (p. 25).

This method of exaggeration is the peculiar vice of Mr. Wilberforce's mind. He lays down one principle, traces it out to its conclusion, and becomes enslaved to it. He cannot see the force of a counteracting principle: he does not make allowance for the limiting and controlling power of other truths equally certain with that which he is pursuing to its consequences.

This is shown in his doctrine concerning Councils. We believe that the Holy Spirit's guidance is present in the Councils of the Church. We also believe that these Councils are constituted by fallible men. Mr. Wilberforce can see no way of reconciling these two doctrines, except by regarding the Council as a mere mouth-piece of the Holy Ghost, in the same way that the prophets of old were His penmen—having 'that peculiar 'authority which belongs to them through the promises and 'indwelling of the Holy Ghost' (p. 79); 'possessed of a living 'power through the presence of the Holy Ghost, who was 'believed to dwell in them' (p. 76); like the Church itself, 'possessed of a being and action which was irrespective of the 'will of its individual members, and was impressed upon it by 'some higher authority' (p. 2); 'guided in interpretation, not 'by logical argumentation, but by the Spirit of God' (p. 36). This theory, and more than this, is, of course, necessary for a Church which presumes to coin a new doctrine in the nineteenth century of the Christian era. But nothing can be well more opposed to the teaching of Vincentius Lirinensis[1] (an author of whom Mr. Wilberforce carefully avoids mention, though dealing often with the same subject, which he discussed at the beginning of the fifth century), and of S. Augustine[2]: nor does it account for facts. A different view may perhaps be less

[1] 'The sacred Council held almost three years since at Ephesus ... in which disputation being had of authorizing rules of faith, lest there might, by chance, some profane novelty creep in, as happened at that perfidious meeting of Ariminum, this was thought the most Catholic, faithful, and best course to be taken, by all the Priests there present, which were about 200 in number, that the opinion of these holy Fathers should be brought forth, of whom it was certain that some of them had been martyrs, some confessors, and that all had lived and died Catholic Priests, that by their consent and verdict, the true religion of ancient doctrine might be duly and solemnly confirmed, and the blasphemy of profane novelty condemned: which being so done, that impious Nestorius was worthily and justly judged to have taught contrary to the old Catholic Faith, and blessed Cyril to have agreed with holy and sacred antiquity.'—Common. c. 29.

[2] 'Even as respects plenary Councils themselves, earlier ones are often improved upon by later, when experience lays open that which was hidden, and makes

Digitized by Google

striking, and less simple, but not therefore the less true. But we hasten over these points, and similar exaggerations of truths spread through the early chapters—not even tempted to linger for the purpose of throwing back the parallel of the Donatists (p. 81), which Bishop Andrewes has long since shown to be applicable not to ourselves, but to the *exclusive* Roman Church.[1] We are anxious, without further delay, to reach ground where we can meet Mr. Wilberforce front to front.

There are four propositions, which, when we have removed all that is extraneous and ornamental, stand out conspicuous as directed against the position of the English Church:—

1. That after the ascension of the Lord, S. Peter was, by Divine appointment, the head and centre of unity to the Apostles and Disciples, as specially representing Christ.

2. That after the death of S. Peter, the Bishops of Rome were, by like appointment, as inheriting S. Peter's privileges, the head and centre of unity to the Christian Church.

3. That the Bishops of Rome filled this position at first as Primates, afterwards as Monarchs; the Primacy and Supremacy being 'the same power under a different name, and in altered circumstances.'

4. That in the sixteenth century the English Church rejected this divinely-constituted head and centre of Christendom, and assumed the King or Queen of England as the head and centre of unity, thereby cutting herself off from the Church Catholic.

These are the fewest propositions to which Mr. Wilberforce's argument can be reduced, and it is clear that every one of them is necessary for its validity. If he fails in his proof of the first, the

known that which was concealed.'—De Baptism. c. Don. 4. Were a Council simply the mouth-piece of the Holy Spirit, no 'experience' of its members could have any effect on its decisions.

[1] 'We plainly acknowledge the Catholic Church, as spread everywhere through all lands, nor will we allow that it is bound down to any spot nor circumscribed by any boundaries. But your Pope dares not thus speak—he dares not even use the word *Catholic* without adding *Roman* to it; but by adding *Roman* he overthrows *Catholic*, as though belief were expressed in what is not confined to any spot, and yet was confined to a certain spot. *Roman-Catholic* is the same as saying *particular-universal* or *part-whole*,—it is shutting up the world in a city. A man who believes this is no Catholic,—he is a Donatist, for as they used to believe in an *African-Catholic* Church, so you, who are in every respect similar to them, believe in a *Roman-Catholic* Church. And, as theirs was not the Catholic Church, because it was African, but only Donatus's party, so yours is not the Catholic Church, because it is Roman, but only the Pope's party.'—Tortura Torti, p. 369.

'"The Roman Church," says the Cardinal, "has got the name of Catholic." What! a part got the name of the whole, an individual got the name of its species! Let him tell that to his own ἰδιῶται! for any one who has the least smattering of learning recognises this claim at once as having a sound of Donatus, who said that Christ had deserted the rest of the world, *et in meridie cubare et pascere*, and was not to be found anywhere else except in Donatus's party. Donatus's assertion, however, is the least objectionable of the two, for he did leave a whole quarter of the globe to Christ, and did not thrust Him into one ruined city. The Cardinal is the worst, in so far as Rome is smaller than Africa.'—Responsio ad Bellarminum, p. 164.

Digitized by Google

three others fall to the ground; and in like manner the second is necessary for the third and fourth—the third for the fourth; and if he fails in proving the fourth, he has failed in that for which all the rest were but steps. It would be enough, therefore, for us to choose out any one of these propositions, and disprove it. Our purpose, however, is to show, with respect to *each one of them*, these two things—1st, that Mr. Wilberforce has not proved his statement; and 2dly, that the statement is untrue.

I. The first thing, then, that we have to do is, to show that Mr. Wilberforce has not proved that after our Lord's ascension S. Peter was, by Divine appointment, the head and centre of unity to the Apostles and Disciples, as specially representing Christ, but that the statement here adduced is a false statement.

The obvious course of proof on Mr. Wilberforce's part would be to appeal at once to Scripture, and show from the Gospels that S. Peter was to be the centre of unity to his brethren, and from the Acts and the Epistles that the Church did actually revolve round him. But before making this attempt, Mr. Wilberforce goes on for 250 years, and lays the foundations of his theory in a passage of S. Cyprian—then returns and endeavours to show that the theory so discovered can be made good from Scripture. This course does not exhibit much confidence in the testimony of Scripture, but yet, were it fairly done, we should not find fault with it; but we are constrained to say that it is not fairly done.

Having quoted some passages of S. Cyprian, all of which we shall presently give, Mr. Wilberforce comments as follows:—

'Such are the statements of the earliest writer on the unity of the Church. He supposed that the whole body of Christ was intended to be one; that its unity was to be of a practical kind, enabling it to speak with authority on all questions which should arise; that its utterance was to be through the consentient determination of all its Bishops; and, finally, (which is the point immediately before us) that their co-operation was secured by that peculiar commission which St. Peter had received, antecedently to the general commission to all the Apostles. And this Primacy he supposed to be inherited by the Bishop of Rome, as occupying the "seat of St. Peter," "the principal Church," "the root and mother" of all the rest. Here, then, is a principle, by which that arrangement under Metropolitans and Patriarchs, which constituted the original organization of the Church, as it was instituted by the Holy Apostles, might receive its completion. For if the mutual interdependence among these several authorities issued in a relation to a single head, it was possible to obviate those disputes, which must necessarily arise, so long as the various parts were wholly independent.'—P. 105.

There is a strange number of inaccuracies in this passage, and we regret to say not only in this passage. It is stated first, that according to S. Cyprian the cooperation of all the Bishops of the Churches was secured by S. Peter's commission.—

Digitized by Google

S. Cyprian makes no such statement. It is stated next, that according to S. Cyprian, S. Peter received a peculiar commission antecedently to the general commission to all the Apostles. —S. Cyprian makes no such statement, but denies it. It is stated next, that S. Cyprian supposed that 'this Primacy,' (*i. e.* that by which unity is secured,) is inherited by the Bishops of Rome.—S. Cyprian makes no statement from which such a 'supposition' of his could be gathered. It is stated next, that S. Cyprian calls the Church of Rome 'the root and mother of all the rest.'—S. Cyprian does not use the expression 'the root and mother of all the rest, of the Churches,' at all; and the expression, 'the root and womb of the Catholic Church,' which he does use, he does not apply to the Church of Rome.

It is stated next, that the arrangement under Metropolitans and Patriarchs was the original organization of the Church instituted by the holy Apostles. Mr. Wilberforce has no grounds for stating that Metropolitans or Patriarchs were instituted by the Apostles beyond his private conjecture. The only necessary elements of Church government are Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. The hierarchy is an arrangement, and a most useful arrangement for ecclesiastical convenience, but it might be swept away at any moment, not without much inconvenience, yet without any injury to the Church in its essential constitution.

It is stated further, that 'disputes must necessarily arise without a single head,' and a page or two before, Mr. Wilberforce speaks of the 'obvious evil, that the Episcopate had certain inde-'pendent heads who were *as likely* to differ as the worldly leaders 'of different countries.' What! This body of which Mr. Wilberforce has such exalted views that he regards the Holy Ghost as dwelling in it in the same sense as He dwelt in our Lord Himself (p. 52)?—this collective Episcopate which he holds to have been endowed with that *grace and truth* with which the Only-begotten of the Father was full (p. 56)? Were the heads of this body, bound thus together by the internal cohesion of the spirit of love, *as likely* to differ as the heads of different countries? Could not that 'collective body of Bishops, in which the 'authority of the Church resides, as inheriting that gift of 'spiritual discernment which had dwelt originally in the person 'of our Lord, and had been bestowed upon the Apostles— 'bestowed in common and exercised by each as the representa-'tive of all'—could not such a body as this fail to quarrel unless prevented by external coercion? Mr. Wilberforce must either give up his lofty views of the nature of the Church, or he must cease to speak of any such form of constitution as monarchy being *necessary* for the preservation of its harmony. *A priori* assumptions of necessity, frequently as they appear in these pages, are wholly out of place on such a subject.

Digitized by Google

It is stated lastly, that without 'relation to a single head,' 'the various parts were *wholly independent.*' They were not wholly independent; they were bound together by that spirit of love which Mr. Wilberforce recognises as dwelling in the Church. They were bound together by that 'one episcopate which is extended through the accordant multiplicity of many Bishops[1] (p. 72), that '*Episcopatus unus, cujus à singulis in solidum pars tenetur*[2] (*Ibid*); by that system of Metropolitans, Primates, Exarchs, Patriarchs, which Mr. Wilberforce has just declared himself to believe was instituted by the Apostles; and lastly, by their dependence upon the one and only true Head of the Church, the Lord JESUS CHRIST.

We thus find in the compass of fourteen lines one mistranslation, four misstatements, one conjecture asserted as a fact, one *à priori* assumption, one exaggeration, and finally a grave omission of counterbalancing facts and statements. This is not the way for a theologian to gain the confidence of his readers. And we must say here, that before we have done, we shall have other mistranslations, misstatements, conjectures, assumptions, exaggerations, and omissions to point out. We now return to the first of these misstatements, for the purpose of showing that Mr. Wilberforce was not justified in declaring that S. Cyprian teaches, that 'a certain prerogative was bestowed upon S. Peter with a view to *maintaining* the oneness of the body of Christ' (p. 103). This assertion he founds on the passage with which 'S. Cyprian opens his treatise on the Unity of the Church.'

'St. Cyprian opens his treatise on the Unity of the Church by reference to a certain prerogative, which he supposes to have been bestowed upon St. Peter, with a view of maintaining the oneness of the body of Christ. "The Lord saith unto Peter, I say unto thee (saith He) that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound also in Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in Heaven." To him again, after His resurrection, He says, "Feed My sheep." *Upon [him being] one He builds His Church; and though He gives to all the Apostles an equal power,* and says, "As my Father sent me, even so send I you; receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosesoever sins ye remit, they shall be remitted to him, and whosesoever sins ye retain, they shall be retained;" *yet in order to manifest unity, He [has] by His own authority so placed the source of the same authority [unity] as to begin from one. Certainly the other Apostles also were what Peter was, endued with an equal fellowship both of power and honour; but a commencement is made from unity, that the Church may be set before us as one;* which one Church in the Song of Songs, doth the Holy Spirit design and name in the person of our Lord. My dove, my spotless one, is but one; she is the only one of her mother-elect of her that bare her. He who holds not this unity of the Church, does he think that he holds the faith?'—P. 103.

Now, in this passage, supposing even that it were rightly

[1] S. Cyprian, Ep. 55, 20. [2] S. Cyp. De Unitate, p. 107. Ed. Fell.

Digitized by Google

translated, which is not the case,' we are unable to see one word about *maintaining* unity. We see two things stated very plainly: 1. That all the other Apostles had equality of power and of honour with S. Peter, so that they were what Peter was; whence it follows that, in the writer's view, S. Peter had no special prerogatives whatever, and no peculiar commission, but all the Apostles were alike that which S. Peter was, all partners with equal shares in respect to power and to honour, *hoc erant ceteri quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio præditi et honoris et potestatis.* And we see it stated, 2. That for the purpose of *manifesting* the Church's unity, in order that the Church *might be set before us, or exhibited, as being one Church,*[2] Christ built the Church upon one, and that he established the origin of unity from one. But to do something for the purpose of showing forth the excellence, and give a lesson, of unity, is one thing—to institute an office for maintaining unity is another thing. The first is what S. Cyprian held; the second is what Mr. Wilberforce attributes to him. Our Lord *manifests and sets before* us humility in washing his disciples' feet: he does not institute the office of feet-washing for the purpose of *maintaining and securing* humility.

The truth is that S. Cyprian, with every other doctor of the Catholic Church, before the Decretals of Isidore were forged, and the Church was rent, teaches as plainly as words can teach, that all the Apostles received whatever S. Peter received, and that all Bishops have alike inherited from them. If the Church was built on one, it was built on all; if the keys were given to one, they were given to all. This doctrine being held as an axiom, they further proceeded to inquire, what might have been the reason why it was to *one* especially that our Lord first promised a gift, which promise was to be fulfilled by His bestowing it upon *all* alike. Reverently musing on the subject, they very generally came to the conclusion, that this was done in order to give a lesson that those powers which were delivered to them in common should yet be exercised in unity. This is a subject on which the great African teachers loved to dwell; and S. Augustine, who never passes by the slightest event recorded in Scripture without seeking to find its meaning, brings this point forward again and again. 'When Christ speaks to one, unity is commended;'[3] (that is, Christ speaks to one to show the excellence

[1] Instead of 'Upon him being one he builds His Church' it ought to be 'Upon one He builds His Church.' The idea is changed by the two words gratuitously introduced. And, instead of '*He has* by His own authority *so placed the source of the same authority* as to begin from one,' it ought to be '*He established* by His authority *the origin of the same unity*, beginning from one.' The meaning of 'Doth the Holy Spirit design and name in the person of our Lord' is 'the Holy Spirit speaking in the person of our Lord, designates, and says.'

[2] Ut Ecclesia una monstretur. [3] S. Aug. tom. v. 1196. Ed. Migne.

Digitized by Google

of unity,) is the thought again and again repeated by him. S. Cyprian's is the same idea, and from S. Cyprian no doubt S. Augustine inherited it. Our own Hammond has a thought very similar, though not identical:—

'The applying the words particularly to S. Peter hath one special energy in it, and concludes that the ecclesiastical powers of economy or stewardship in Christ's house, of which the keys are the token, belongs to single persons, such as S. Peter was, and not only to consistories or assemblies; that whatsoever S. Peter acted by virtue of Christ's power then promised, he should be fully able to act himself, without the conjunction of any other; and that what he then did *clave non errante*, no one or more men on earth could rescind without him, which is a just ground for placing the power ecclesiastical in single persons, and not in communities—in the Prelate of each Church, and not in the Presbyters.'[1]

Thus, in this circumstance, Hammond sees inculcated the authority of the power of the single Bishop; SS. Cyprian and Augustine see the unity of the Episcopate, and of the Church, commended. Both lessons may, we doubt not, be profitably drawn from it, but we cannot find, nor did S. Cyprian teach, that any 'prerogative was bestowed on S. Peter for maintaining the oneness of the body of Christ.'

Having founded his theory upon the passage which has been quoted and considered, Mr. Wilberforce confirms it from S. Cyprian's other writings; and also adduces the passages on which he establishes his two next misstatements, viz. that the Bishops of Rome, according to S. Cyprian, inherited that Primacy by which the cooperation of Bishops was secured, and that the Church of Rome is called by him 'the root and mother of all the rest.'

'This general statement respecting the office of St. Peter, is borne out by the repeated assertions which St. Cyprian makes in his letters, both that St. Peter possessed such a preeminence, and that it had been bestowed upon him for the purpose of preserving the Church's unity. "For to Peter, on whom He built His Church, and from whom He caused the principle of unity to take shape and form, did our Lord first give that power, that what was bound on earth should be bound in heaven." It was Peter, then, "on whom the Church was built by our Lord." He it was "whom our Lord chose as first, and on whom He built His Church," and who "had the Primacy." In another letter he complains that certain malcontents from Africa "dare to sail to the see of Peter, and to the principal Church, whence sacerdotal unity has arisen." But they forget, he adds, that the parties whom they designed to mislead, "were those Romans whose faith was praised by the Apostle, to whom perfidy (*i.e.* faithlessness in doctrine) cannot make its approach." For the Bishop of Rome, according to him, was St. Peter's successor; Cornelius, he says, was chosen to be Pope at a time when "the place of Fabianus, that is, the place of Peter, and the rank of the sacerdotal chair was vacant." He speaks of the Church of Rome as "the root and mother of the Catholic Church," and says that to communicate with its Bishop was "the same thing as to communicate with the Catholic Church." For, "there is one Church, which was founded by Christ

[1] On Schism, p. 243. Oxf. 1849.

Digitized by Google

our Lord upon Peter, on the principle, and by the law of unity." And during the vacancy of the see of Rome, he appears to recognise the claim to superintendence which was set up by its presbyter, because they say, "it is incumbent upon us, who appear to be put in authority, to guard the flock in place of its pastor." Neither does his correspondent, Firmilian, though exhibiting the utmost hostility against St. Stephen, the existing Bishop of Rome, denying what he states to be St. Stephen's assertion, that "he holds the succession of Peter, on whom was laid the foundations of the Church;" and again, that "he has, by succession, the chair of Peter." '—P. 104.

We have already seen that it is necessary to watch Mr. Wilberforce's extracts with jealousy. This will appear more evident when we have examined the present passage. The first extract is taken from the 73d Epistle of S. Cyprian. We give the passage at greater length, and with greater accuracy:—

'For to Peter, *in the first place*, on whom he built the Church, and from whom he appointed and shewed forth the origin of unity, the Lord gave that power that whatsoever *he should loose* on earth should be loosed in heaven. *He speaks to the Apostles, and* after the resurrection also, saying, As my Father, &c. *Whence we learn* '—what? that S. Peter was the centre of unity? No, but—'that they only who are set over the Church, and are appointed by the law of the Gospel and the ordinance of the Lord, may lawfully baptize and give remission of sins . . . . . that no one can usurp to himself against Bishops and Priests what is not in his own right and power.'[1]

Then S. Cyprian did see an exclusive prerogative granted by the words of our Lord; but was it the prerogative of S. Peter? No, it was the prerogative which was received in common by the one Episcopate and Priesthood, of which S. Peter was at a particular moment the symbol.

The words of the second extract are repeated in the third,—

'They say that herein they follow ancient custom . . . but we must not frame a prescription from custom, but prevail by reason. For neither did Peter, whom the Lord chose *first*, and on whom he built his Church, when Paul *afterwards* disputed with him about circumcision, claim or assume anything insolently or arrogantly to himself; so as to say that he held *the primacy*, and should rather be obeyed of *those late and newly come* . . . giving us a lesson of concord and patience, not to love our own opinions obstinately, but rather to count as our own the useful and wholesome suggestions of our brethren and colleagues, if they are true and legitimate.'[2]

We have not the smallest objection to admitting a Primacy in S. Peter. We believe him to have been *primus inter pares* amongst the Apostles. What we object to is the doctrine that he held a Primacy which made him the centre of unity, as being the special representative of our Lord. This passage, however, has probably nothing to do with Primacy of place at all. It seems to refer only to priority of time. In page 130 the passage is again quoted, with the same application. In like manner, we have not the least objection to acknowledging the Church

[1] S. Cyp. Ep. 73, 7, p 201. [2] S. Cyp. Ep. 71, 3, p. 194.

Digitized by Google

of Rome to have been 'the principal Church.' The Second and Fourth Œcumenical Councils tell us that it was, and why it was, viz. because Rome was the imperial city; but from the use which Tertullian and the translator of S. Irenæus make of the word *principalis*, we know that it probably means 'early-founded.'[1] That S. Cyprian held the Romans to be infallible, as seems to be darkly hinted, because he used the expression, 'to whom faithlessness in doctrine cannot approach,' cannot unfortunately be the case, unless we believe that he intended to assert that Rom. i. 8, 'I thank my God through Jesus Christ 'for you all, that your faith is spoken of throughout the whole 'world,' conveys a grant of infallibility from that time forward to the Romans: for it is to that text which he refers when he speaks of 'their faith being praised by the Apostle.' That the Bishop of Rome was considered by S. Cyprian to have succeeded S. Peter in his episcopate of Rome, which we have next paraded, is an undoubted fact. In like manner he considered the Bishop of Alexandria to have succeeded S. Mark in the episcopate of Alexandria, and we consider Archbishop Sumner to have succeeded S. Augustine in the episcopate of Canterbury. But what does it prove? Mr. Wilberforce says, that S. Cyprian, therefore, supposed that the Primacy—the Vicarial Primacy, as we may term it—which made S. Peter the centre of unity, was inherited by the Bishops of Rome. Now, he never once speaks of the Bishop of Rome succeeding even to *that* Primacy of S. Peter which he *did* perhaps acknowledge, but only to his episcopate of the Roman see.[2]

We next come to the declaration that S. Cyprian 'speaks of the Church of Rome as "the root and mother of the Catholic Church,"' *Ecclesiæ Catholicæ radicem et matricem;* which is given as root and mother of all the rest,' in the next page. Here we have three things to consider: 1, the meaning of *matrix;* 2, the meaning of *Ecclesiæ Catholicæ matrix;* 3, whether or no it is true that it is the Church of Rome to which S. Cyprian applies that expression. 1. The meaning of the word *matrix* is 'womb;' in a derivative sense it is applied to the 'parent-stem' of a plant, as distinct from suckers; to the 'breeding-mothers' of animals; and by a further extension of the derivative sense, it may mean 'source,' or

[1] S. Cyp. Ep. 59, 19, p. 136. See Tertullian, De Præsc. Hæret. c. 31. 'Ad *principalitatem* veritati et *posteritatem* mendacitati deputandam.' And S. Irenæus, lib. iii. c. 3. § 2. 'propter potentiorem principalitatem'—seemingly a translation of διὰ τὴν ἱκανωτέραν ἀρχαιότητα.

[2] 'Cornelius was made *Bishop* by the judgment of God and his Christ . . . When there had been no one made before him, and the place of Fabian, that is, the place of Peter, and the rank of the episcopal (*sacerdotalis*) chair was vacant.' Ep. 55, 7, p. 104.

Digitized by Google

'origin.' Tertullian uses the word. He is speaking of the Churches founded by the Apostles, such as Corinth, Ephesus, Antioch, Philippi, &c.; and he calls them the '*matrices et originales fidei.*'[1] Mr. Wilberforce quotes this passage, in p. 94, and translates the word correctly, 'Such Churches which the 'Apostles themselves founded were considered to be the *wombs* 'and originals of the faith.' There, where *matrix* was applied to several Churches, Mr. Wilberforce translates it *womb:* here where he represents it to be applied to the Church of Rome, he translates it *mother*. There must be a reason for this difference. Is it because there is an idea of authority conveyed in the title, *mother*, which is not found in the word *matrix?* Or is it that it was desirable to have S. Cyprian's authority for a title which Rome has assumed to herself, although common sense, history, and the canons of the Church, apply it, when it is applied in any special manner at all, to the Church of Jerusalem? As a second step towards assimilating S. Cyprian's expression to the modern assumption, 'mother of the Catholic Church' is changed into 'mother of all the rest,' *i.e.* of all Churches. 2. What is the meaning of *Ecclesiæ Catholicæ* matrix? Does it mean the womb from which the Catholic Church issued, or the womb of the Catholic Church, in which Christians are formed? Assuredly the latter. We will take the other metaphor; '*Ecclesiæ Catholicæ radix,*' does not mean the root on which the Catholic Church grew, but the root of the Catholic Church on which Christians grow. 3. Does S. Cyprian then say, that it is the Church of Rome which is the root and womb of the Catholic Church?—No, he says nothing of the kind. The case is this: There was the Novatian Schism breaking out in Rome, and S. Cyprian found it necessary to take every measure for the preservation of the unity of the Church. For this purpose he sent messengers and wrote letters to Rome, urging the Romans to acknowledge Cornelius as their true Bishop, and cease to follow the Novatian schism. 'With every exhortation we can,' he writes to the Roman Confessors, 'we beg and beseech you to return to the Church your mother, and to our brotherhood' (Ep. 46). He tells Cornelius that he had written to them to urge them 'to return to their mother, that is, the Catholic Church' (Ep. 47). And then he assures Cornelius, that he had desired every one who sailed from Africa to Italy to 'acknowledge and hold fast to *the root and womb of the Catholic Church*' (Ep. 48). Is it not clear that 'the root and womb of the Catholic Church' in Ep. 48 is the same thing as 'their mother, that is, the Catholic Church,' in Ep. 47? S. Cyprian warns his

[1] Tertull. De Præsc. Hæret. c. 21.

Digitized by Google

countrymen, when they sail to Italy, to avoid the Novatian heretics, and hold fast to the Catholic Church, which is the root on which all orthodox Christians grow, and the womb in which they are formed. And this Mr. Wilberforce transforms into, 'He 'speaks of the Church of Rome as "the root and mother of the 'Catholic Church—the root and mother of all the rest."' The same exhortation might be given by the Bishop of London to men sailing to the Cape of Good Hope.

We then find that 'He says that to communicate with the 'Bishop of the Church of Rome, was the same thing as to 'communicate with the Catholic Church.' We would sooner have made a directly false statement—a statement resting on no foundation whatever—than have written and published that sentence. Liguori himself would not justify it. The Epistle referred to is the 55th, written to Antonianus, who was living in Rome. At the time that S. Cyprian wrote, there were existing in Rome the two parties to which we have made allusion; the orthodox, or Catholic party, headed by Cornelius; the heretical and schismatical party, headed by Novatian. Cornelius had been duly consecrated 'by sixteen fellow Bishops;' and yet Novatian was 'endeavouring by intrigue, to be made 'an adulterous and strange Bishop.' 'And whereas there is 'one Church, from Christ throughout the whole world, divided 'into many members, and one Episcopate diffused throughout 'an harmonious multitude of many bishops, he, notwithstanding 'the unity of the Catholic Church, everywhere compacted and 'joined together, attempts to make a human Church, and sends 'his new Apostles through very many cities, that he may 'establish certain recent foundations of his own institution: 'and whereas there have been already ordained through all the 'provinces, and through every city, Bishops, in age venerable, 'in faith sound, in trials proved, in persecution banished, he 'dares to create other false Bishops over them[1].' Thus, we see that there were two parties in Rome; the Catholic Church presided over by Cornelius, and a schismatical body presided over by Novatian. Under these circumstances, S. Cyprian writes his letter to Antonianus.

'Cyprian to Antonianus, his brother, greeting. I received your first letter, dearest brother, firmly upholding the concord of the sacerdotal [*i.e.* episcopal] college, and cleaving to the Catholic Church; wherein you signified that you did not communicate with Novatian, but followed my advice, and held one consent with Cornelius our brother-bishop. You wrote also that I should transmit a copy of the same letter to our colleague Cornelius, in order that he might now lay aside all anxiety, and be sure *that you held communion with him, that is, with the Catholic Church.* But there has since arrived your second letter, sent by Quintus our brother

[1] S. Cyp. p. 131. Oxf. Tr. p. 112. Ed. Fell.

Digitized by Google

presbyter, by which I see that your mind has been influenced by a letter of Novatian, and has begun to waver.'—Ep. 55, p. 101.

Now what would be more natural than for Cardinal Wiseman to write to a friend in New York, and say, 'If you communicate 'with Archbishop Hughes. you will hold communion with the 'Catholic Church?' Would that imply that Cardinal Wiseman regarded Archbishop Hughes as the divinely-appointed centre of Christendom? Or again, what more natural than for Bishop Potter to write to a friend in England, and say, 'Avoid the 'novel *pseudepiscopi* and the schismatical congregations, insti- 'tuted by Cardinal Wiseman. By communicating with the 'Bishop of London you communicate with the Catholic Church?' Would he thereby mean that communion with the Bishops of London, past, present, and future, was a necessary condition of Catholic communion? It must be a weak case and a bad cause that requires such forced wrenchings of simple words as this.

The next passage, from Ep. 70, 3, *una Ecclesia à Christo Domino super Petrum origine unitatis et ratione fundata*, repeats the view, that a lesson of unity is taught by our Lord's having addressed himself especially to one of the Apostles. There remains only one more passage of S. Cyprian to be considered, selected from Ep. 8. 1. The facts connected with it are as follows:—Fabian Bishop of Rome was dead, and S. Cyprian had retired from his see in time of persecution. During this vacancy the Roman presbyters write to the Carthaginian presbyters reflecting invidiously upon S. Cyprian for having withdrawn himself from danger, and saying, among other things, 'that it is incumbent upon us,' (*i. e.* on the presbyters in Rome and Carthage respectively,) 'who appear to be put in authority, to guard the flock in place of its pastor' (*i. e.* instead of Fabian in one case, and of Cyprian in the other.)[1] They then proceed to give their brother presbyters some advice as to the lapsed. This letter was forwarded to S. Cyprian, in his place of retreat, by the Carthaginian clergy, and was at once sent back by him to the Roman presbyters, with a note, saying that he could not believe that they had written it, on account, apparently, of the

[1] When we get fifty pages further, this same quotation appears in a strengthened form. In p. 155 it is translated 'because it is incumbent on us *who seem to be put* 'in the chief place, (the word is *præpositi*) to guard the flock in the absence of the 'shepherd;' and on the warranty of this sentence it is asserted, that 'they speak of 'themselves as exercising a trust which embraced other countries.' Supposing that the *us* did mean only the Roman Presbyters, and not the Carthaginian Presbyters as well, the argument would still be utterly inconclusive. When the President of a college dies, the Vice-President might speak of himself in a letter to a Fellow of another college as feeling that it was incumbent upon him, since he held a position of authority, to guard the college in place of the Head. Would he thereby speak of himself as exercising a trust which embraced other colleges?

Digitized by Google

unkindly tone toward himself which pervaded it. But, as the presbyters took the same side with S. Cyprian in the dispute about the lapsed, and those times of persecution and division were not days for ceremony, he afterwards wrote and explained why he had withdrawn from death, recounting the measures which he had taken during his exile, with regard to the lapsed, and concluding as follows:—

'Whereas it seemed right that honour should be shown to the martyrs, and yet the violence of those who desired to throw everything into confusion be checked; and, moreover, having read your letter lately sent to my clergy through Crementius the sub-deacon, to the effect that help should be extended to such as were seized with sickness after having lapsed, and penitently desired communion, I thought it right to abide by that which was also your opinion, lest our conduct, which ought to be united, and agree in all things, should in some respect differ. As to the case of the rest, notwithstanding they have received letters from the martyrs, I ordered them to be entirely deferred, and to be reserved until my return; that so, when the Lord shall have vouchsafed us peace, and several of us who hold rule shall have met together, we may, after communicating our counsels with you too, set in order and restore everything.'—Ep. 20, p. 43.

Here we see an example of Catholic intercommunion, and joint care for the things of Christ, in the two Churches of Italy and Africa, but where is there any 'claim to superintendence' made by the Roman presbyters, or any 'recognition' of such claims by S. Cyprian? If the Roman superintendence is thus proved, how much more must the Carthaginian superintendence be proved by 'the most blessed and most glorious Pope' S. Cyprian himself (so the Roman presbyters call him, Ep. 30), sending to Rome both letters (Ep. 46, 47) and messengers (Ep. 45,) 'to endeavour to bring back the members of the 'divided body to the unity of the Catholic Church, and to knit 'the bond of Christian love.' Had Cornelius done this to Cyprian, instead of Cyprian to Cornelius, it would no doubt be brought forward as an act done in virtue of his Primacy; for it was an act of interference in the diocese and city of Rome itself, and it was performed for the purpose of securing the unity of the Church.

We will now supply two statements of S. Cyprian, to counterbalance those which Mr. Wilberforce has extracted; the first to show, *ex abundanti*, what S. Cyprian understood by the promise to S. Peter, and the second to point out his view of the real bond of unity in the Church.

'Our Lord, whose precepts and warnings we ought to observe, determining the honour of a Bishop, and the ordering of His own Church, speaks in the Gospel, and says to Peter, "I say unto thee," &c. *Thence* the ordination of Bishops and the ordering of the Church come down along the course of time and line of succession, so that the Church is

Digitized by Google

settled upon her Bishops, and every act of the Church is regulated by these same Prelates.'—*Ep.* 33, p. 75, *Oxf. Tr.*; p. 66, *Ed. Fell.*

Then what S. Cyprian understood by S. Matt. xvi. 16—19 was nothing else than this, that the Church was founded upon the one Episcopate.

Again, in the 66th Epistle, he defines the Church as follows:—'They are the Church, who are a people united to the 'Bishop (*sacerdoti*,) and a flock adhering to their own shepherd. 'Whence you ought to know that the Bishop is in the Church, 'and the Church in the Bishop.' Each diocese was a type of the whole; and what was the bond of unity to the whole? 'It is,' he says, 'in truth connected and joined together by the 'cement of bishops (*sacerdotum*,) mutually cleaving to each 'other.'[1] Then the unity of Bishops in godly love is, in S. Cyprian's view, the bond of the Church, not any prerogative of S. Peter, nor any authority vested in the Bishop of Rome. In Dr. Pusey's words, 'S. Cyprian's idea of the Epi-'scopate is manifoldness in unity; many shepherds feeding one 'flock; yet therefore many, that they might act in unity 'against any who would waste it: a large body, but cemented 'by the glue of mutual concord and bond of unity; many rays, 'streams, branches, to diffuse everywhere light, fertility, nou-'rishment, yet the connected issues from One Source.'[2] And again, 'Unity being an effluence from the Unity of God, a 'fruit of the indwelling of His Spirit, His bond, knitting and 'joining together His own, typified in the Sacraments and itself 'a Sacrament, faith in love; its maintenance was not the main-'tenance of anything outward, but the development of an in-'ward grace—as being a grace, it must emanate from within.'[3]

The best commentary on S. Cyprian's statements is S. Cyprian's conduct. Do we, then, find him recognising obedience to the Bishop of Rome, as the instrument for securing unity? On the contrary, the course which he adopts is totally incompatible with such an hypothesis. This appears in two instances—the controversy on Rebaptism, and the dispute about the Spanish Bishops, Basilides and Martial. The former was a serious question of discipline involving doctrine: S. Cyprian, Alexandria, and the East, took one side; S. Stephen, and the rest of the West, the other; and the latter cut off from himself by excommunication all that did not agree with him. Now did S. Cyprian acknowledge the authority of S. Peter's successor to heal this breach of unity? On the contrary, in Dean Milman's words, 'He condemns the perverseness, obstinacy, 'contumacy of Stephen. He promulgates in Latin a letter of

[1] Ep. 66, p. 207, Oxf. Tr.; p. 168, Ed. Fell. [2] Pref. Oxf. Tr. p. xviii.
[3] Pref. p. xiii.

Digitized by Google

'Firmilian, Bishop of the Cappadocian Cæsarea, still more 'unmeasured in its censures. Firmilian denounces the audacity, 'the violence of Stephen, scoffs at his boasted descent from 'S. Peter: declares that by his sin he has excommunicated 'himself: he is the schismatic, the apostate from the unity of 'the Church. A solemn council of eighty-seven Bishops, 'assembled at Carthage, under Cyprian, asserted the inde-'pendent judgment of the African Churches, repudiated the 'assumption of the title Bishop of Bishops, or the arbitrary 'dictation of one Bishop to Christendom.'[1] The words of this African Council (distinctly approved afterwards by S. Augustine) are as follows:—

'It remains for us each to deliver our sentiments on this matter, judging no one, nor removing any one, if he be of a different opinion, from the right of communion. For no one of us sets himself up to be a Bishop of Bishops, or by force of his tyranny compels his colleagues to the necessity of obedience; since every Bishop, according to his recognized liberty and power, possesses a free choice, and can no more be judged by another than he himself can judge another: but let us all await the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who singly and alone has the power both of setting us up in the government of His Church, and of judging our proceedings.'—*Op. S. Cyp.* p. 329, *Ed. Baluz.*

In like manner, when the Spanish Bishops, Basilides and Martial, lapsed in the Decian persecution, and were accordingly deprived of their Bishoprics, Felix and Sabinus being consecrated in their place,—

'Basilides found his way to Rome, and imposed by his arts on the unsuspecting Stephen, who commanded his reinstatement in his high office. Appeal was made to Carthage against Rome. Cyprian would strengthen his own authority by that of a synod. At the head of his thirty-five Bishops, Cyprian approves the acts of the presbyters of Leon and Astorga in rejecting such unworthy Bishops; treats with a kind of respectful compassion the weakness of Stephen of Rome, who had been so easily abused; and exhorts the Spaniards to adhere to their rightful Prelates, Felix and Sabinus.'—*Milman*, p. 54. *S. Cyp. Ep.* lxvii. p. 173.

Could S. Cyprian have so acted, had he regarded the authority of the Bishop of Rome over the whole Church as the divinely appointed means of securing the unity of that Church? Could S. Firmilian, twice appealed to by Mr. Wilberforce, have held the same theory, when he speaks of Stephen's 'inhumanitas,' 'audacia,' 'insolentia,' 'res ab eo improbe gestæ,' 'manifesta stultitia,' 'imperitia,' 'contumacis furor discordiæ,' because he took a step by which, had S. Firmilian accepted the theory now thrust upon him, he must have acknowledged that the Bishop of Rome was simply fulfilling the duties of his station, and to which he was bound to pay unhesitating obedience? Could he have said that he was 'betraying and deserting unity?'

[1] Latin Christianity, vol. i. p. 53.

Digitized by Google

Could he have turned upon him and cried, 'Nay, but thou 'art worse than every heretic! What struggles and dis- 'sension are you spreading through the Churches of all the 'world! How great a sin have you heaped upon yourself 'when you cut yourself off from so many flocks! For you 'have cut *yourself* off. Don't be mistaken. Since he is the 'true schismatic who makes himself an apostate from the com- 'munion of the unity of the Church. For while you are 'thinking that every one can be separated off from you, you 'have separated yourself off from every one. And not even 'the Apostle's precepts (Eph. iv. i.) can fashion you to the 'rule of Truth and Peace!'[1] All this because Stephen did what S. Firmilian knew that he was bound to do by Christ's command, *if he held the theory* which Mr. Wilberforce attributes to him.

We have now gone through all the passages adduced by Mr. Wilberforce in proof of S. Cyprian's holding the views which he fathers upon him, with the exception of two which are reserved for a note attached to his first extract. We will examine the note too.

'Several other sentences occur in the Benedictine edition, but have not been introduced into the text, because their authority is disputed. And it will be seen that statements equivalent to them occur in St. Cyprian's letters, *e. g.* "Primacy is given to Peter, that the Church of Christ may be set forth as one, and the see (cathedra) as one. And they all are shepherds, yet the flock is one, such as to be fed by all the Apostles with unanimous agreement." And again: "He who deserts the see of Peter, on whom the Church is founded, is he assured that he is in the Church?"'—*De Unit.* 3, 4.—P. 103.

Now on this we have two remarks to make. First, that Mr. Wilberforce has so arranged his words as to give the impression—an impression which we believe ninety-nine out of every hundred readers would have,—that these are the extracts which come from the genuine Epistles, and are 'equivalent to' the 'disputed' passages which he has omitted; whereas, in spite of the way in which the *e. g.* is introduced, they are the very 'disputed' passages themselves. And secondly, that 'disputed authenticity' is not the term which ought to have been applied to them. Their history is as follows, and it is the more necessary to notice it, as Dean Milman has been deceived by the authority of the Benedictine text into quoting them as genuine, and founding his estimate of S. Cyprian's regard for the Roman Bishops upon them.[2] We quote part of a note attached to the Treatise on Unity in the Oxford Translation of S. Cyprian's works:—

'The additions contained in the Benedictine reading are not found in the first editions of S. Cyprian, (representing probably very ancient and inde-

[1] S. Firm. Ep. ad S. Cyp. cxvii.

[2] Latin Christianity, p. 52.

Digitized by Google

pendent MSS.,) between A. D. 1471—1563: viz. one at Rome in 1471; one at Venice in the same year; one without date and place; one at Paris, 1512, (according to the Benedictines a very accurate edition, and agreeing with the MSS. when other editions had changed for the worse); that of Erasmus, Basle, 1520; one at Cologne, 1520; of Gravius (a very learned Dominican), at Cologne, 1544 (in which fresh MSS. were consulted); Antwerp, 1541 and 1542; Venice, 1547; and in which list reprints are not included. Nor are the additions found in two extant MSS., each more than a thousand years old. Nor are they found in eight of the Vatican MSS.; and Baluzius numbered up twenty-seven which he had seen in which they were wanting. Bishop Fell mentions nine English MSS., and one of Beneventum, which are without the additions. The passage is quoted without them by Pope Calixtus II. in the twelfth century; by the meeting of Cardinals at Liburnum in the fifteenth; and by the Roman correctors after Manutius had inserted it in his edition. They appear, moreover, to have been unknown to the German MSS. in the age of Venericus (A. D. 1080). For these reasons Baluzius omitted them in his edition of S. Cyprian's works in the beginning of the eighteenth century; but on his dying suddenly, while the work was passing through the press, the Benedictines into whose hands it came, retaining his note in which he gave his reasons against them, cancelled the leaf, and restored them, giving as their reason that the additions had been preserved in all the editions which had appeared in France for the 150 years before their time. . . . Baluzius also, it would seem, spoke more strongly against them than his words now stand; the Benedictines confessing that they were obliged to "alter not a few things in his notes, and that they would have altered more if they could conveniently."'—P. 151.

Mr. Wilberforce must not use a tone of generosity, on the ground that he makes use only in a note of passages whose 'authenticity' is *thus* 'disputed.'

We have now examined all the passages which Mr. Wilberforce has adduced from S. Cyprian. We must recollect that he has claimed this especial Father from all the Fathers of the Church, in order to find in him the theory which he requires, and that he professes to find taught in these extracts two leading truths, 1. That S. Peter received a special prerogative from Christ for maintaining (p. 103), preserving (p. 104), securing (p. 105), providing for (p. 119), giving (p. 164), unity, as being himself 'that centre of unity who bore the keys of office in the midst of 'his brethren' (p. 119). 2. That this office and authority, by means of which unity was to be secured, was inherited by the Roman Bishops. We have seen that no such doctrines were held by S. Cyprian, but that, on the contrary, he declares (1) that both in power and in honour all the other Apostles were equal to S. Peter—that he never speaks of his maintaining, preserving, securing, providing for his brethren's unity, or being the centre of unity to them; but he conceives that Christ intending to teach the lesson that the Church was one, and the Episcopate one, and that it was a good and joyful thing to dwell together in unity, addressed himself for that reason espe-

Digitized by Google

cially to one.[1] And we have seen (2) that he is the energetic and vehement defender of national, of provincial and of diocesan independence; that by word and deed, he and S. Firmilian alike reject every particle of control on the part of the Roman Bishops; that he never in any place asserts that the Bishop of Rome succeeded to any office of S. Peter, except that of presiding over the Roman diocese; that he holds the true Head of the Church to be the Lord JESUS CHRIST (De Unit. 3); and the bond of unity, to be the mutual cleaving of the Bishops to each other by the spirit of love (Ep. lxvi. 7). Mr. Wilberforce's theory is one thing, S. Cyprian's is another. To identify them is impossible.

Having laid his foundation under the shadow of S. Cyprian's name, Mr. Wilberforce returns from the middle of the third century to the Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles, to see if his theory can be made to agree with them. He says that, 'a 'primacy is assigned to St. Peter in the Gospels, and recognised 'in the Acts and the Epistles.' It is unfortunate to have to deal with ambiguous expressions. Primacy may signify primacy in place, or primacy in time: and again, primacy in place may mean primacy of power, or primacy of honour; and still again primacy of power may mean fifty different things, according as the degree of power is greater or less. The head-master of a school holds a primacy, the head boy of the school holds a primacy, the head boy in each class holds a primacy, the best cricketer holds a primacy, the best verse-maker holds a primacy, but all in different senses. We must recollect, then, what sort of primacy it is that Mr. Wilberforce has to prove for S. Peter out of the Gospels, Acts, and Epistles. It is a Primacy which makes S. Peter 'the especial representative of His Master' (p. 111), 'associated by peculiar copartnership in one of the 'functions of His Master, and become by grace that which 'Christ was by nature' (p. 112), which 'especially identifies him 'with his master' (p. 115), which makes him have 'individually 'the trust which his brethren received collectively' (p. 116), which 'makes provision for their unity of action' (p. 119), which constitutes him 'that centre of unity who bore the keys of office in the midst of his brethren' (p. 119). Any passages, therefore, which can be fully accounted for on the theory that S. Peter was *primus inter pares*, the most prominent and first among his equal brethren, is irrelevant to Mr. Wilberforce's purpose, and must be put aside accordingly. Such a Primacy

[1] So his follower, S. Pacian, 'The Lord spake a little above to Peter (He spake to one, that from one He might lay he foundation of Unity;) afterwards, delivering the very same command in common to all, He still begins in the same terms as to Peter.—Ep. iii. 26, p. 348, Oxf. Tr.

Digitized by Google

as this will not satisfy the necessities of Mr. Wilberforce's argument, which requires what we have called a Vicarial Primacy.

Six points are adduced from the Gospels: 1. That S. Peter's name stands at the beginning of the list of the Apostles' names. Would this be the case were S. Peter simply *primus inter pares?* Yes. Then it proves nothing, and goes towards proving nothing for Mr. Wilberforce's Vicarial Primacy.

2. 'S. Matthew terms him, the first Apostle' (p. 135), and 'the Primacy is attributed to him by the evangelist' (p. 108). Do our readers recollect where? It is in S. Matt. x. 2. 'Now 'the names of the twelve Apostles are these: the first, Simon, 'who is called Peter, and Andrew his brother,' &c. If, in giving a list of the English Bishops, we should say, 'The first, Dr. Blomfield, Bishop of London, Dr. Sumner, Bishop of Winchester,' &c., would it be correct to say, that we had 'attributed the Primacy' to Dr. Blomfield? Would the words of the evangelist be naturally accounted for by the supposition that S. Peter was *primus inter pares?* Yes; we should use the same expression with regard to the Bishop of London, but yet we should not mean that he was the centre of unity to his brother Bishops. Then S. Matthew's expression is valueless for Mr. Wilberforce's purpose.

3. 'S. Peter, and S. Peter only, received a new name when 'he was admitted into the number of the Apostles. Our Lord 'bestowed the epithet of Sons of Thunder on the two next of 'his Apostles; but it was an epithet only by which their 'original names were not superseded' (p. 109). First for the fact. The name of Simon was not superseded. The very last time that our Lord addressed him He called him Simon, son of Jonah, and according to the interpretation of Origen, S. Augustin, and others, the name Peter is an epithet, meaning 'a rockman,' and derived from πέτρα just as a 'Christian' is derived from Χριστός. Further, there is not the smallest difference in the account given by S. Mark of the imposition of the name on S. Peter and on SS. James and John; 'And Simon he *surnamed* 'Peter, and James the son of Zebedee, and John the brother of 'James; and he *surnamed* them Boanerges, which is, the Sons 'of Thunder' (Mark iii. 16, 17). As to 'the name conveying 'an especial authority to represent Himself,' owing to its 'deri-'vation from Himself,' the name *Christian* is equally derived from Him, and would by the same argument convey the same authority. And so Origen tells us distinctly that Peter, or Rockman, does mean no more than Christian, and that all true Christians are Peters, one title being derived from one name of our Lord, and the other from the other. 'All the followers of

Digitized by Google

'Christ derive their name from the Rock. . . . Being members of 'Christ, by derivation of name they are called Christians, and 'by derivation from Rock (πέτρα) they are called Rockmen '(πέτροι). And on the same principle you will say that those 'who are called righteous derive their names from the righteous-'ness of Christ, and the wise from the wisdom of Christ, and so 'from all the other appellations you will make derivative names 'for the saints; and to all who are such, the words of our 'Saviour will be addressed: "Thou art Peter," &c., down to '"shall not prevail against it."'[1] This name, then, did not convey anything in S. Peter beyond what was conveyed to the converts of Antioch by the name Christian.

4. and 5. S. Matt. xvi. 18 ('Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church') *directly*, and S. Matt. xvi. 19 ('And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven') *indirectly* declare that S. Peter 'should be asso-'ciated by peculiar copartnership in one of the functions of 'his Master, and become by grace that which Christ was by 'nature' (p. 112). These are very tremendous words. If they are true, we can see little reason why S. Peter should not have been associated with S. Mary in the ceremony of December 8th. But what is the connexion between these two texts and these words? Mr. Wilberforce finds the following. The name Peter is derived from our Lord's title *petra*; therefore, the imposition of the name Peter implies that Simon was 'associated with' (p. 112), 'especially identified with' (p. 115), 'made the especial representative of' (p. 112)—had Mr. Wilberforce been a little bolder he would have said—'made the one Vicar of Christ.' Exactly on the same reasoning the name Christian is derived from our Lord's title *Christus*. Does then the imposition of the name Christian imply that every one so called is especially associated and identified with Christ, and made his peculiar representative and vicar? Either it does, or it does not. If it does not, neither does the name Peter imply it; if it does, Peter has on this showing no *special* prerogative beyond that which any Christian has.

The argument founded on the other text is still more extraordinary. 'It is Christ who hath the key of the house of David,' therefore this text indicates the transference from him to Peter of 'his office—his function of bearing the keys' (p. 112). Now it is almost certain that a mystical expression applied to Eliakim the son of Hilkiah by Isaiah, and to our Lord in the Book of Revelation, has nothing whatever to do with this text. But be that as it may, it is quite certain, by the testimony of all writers of the early ages of the Church, which Mr. Wilberforce

[1] Origen, in S. Matt. xvi. 18, vol. iii. p. 526.—Ed. Delarue.

Digitized by Google

is bound on his own principles to accept before an interpretation devised by himself, that no power of the keys was granted to S. Peter in Matt. xvi. 18, which was not granted to all the Apostles in Matt. xviii.18, and John xx. 22, 23. Accordingly, either all the Apostles have 'become by grace that which Christ was by nature,' or S. Peter has not. For the Patristic expositions of these texts we must refer our readers to 'Papal Supremacy tested by Antiquity,' pp. 37, 48. The words of S. Augustine, S. Cyril of Alexandria, S. Chrysostom, Origen, S. Basil the Great, Theodoret, S. Hilary, S. Gregory the Great, and Ælfric, are all there quoted, and show that the general view of these Fathers and Doctors is, that Christ as confessed by Peter was the Rock of the Church, and that S. Peter was the representative, not of his Master, as Mr. Wilberforce would have it, but of the other Apostles, and therein of the Bishops their successors, and of the Church at large. Many more names of early writers might be added to these, and there is not a single passage in antiquity which bears out Mr. Wilberforce's interpretation. The passages which he quotes from Origen, S. Leo, S. Augustine, S. Jerome, S. Ambrose, S. Chrysostom, Tertullian, and Hippolytus, are either irrelevant or dead against his view. He acknowledges 'that the word Rock is employed by the ancient 'writers for two persons and two things—Christ and Peter; the 'objective faith taught by the Lord, the subjective faith taught 'by and entertained by his disciples' (p. 112). This admission in itself would be quite sufficient to overthrow his theory. If these texts meant what he asserts, there *must* have been a perfect knowledge of it in the early Church; they could not have been ignorant of the bearing of words of such importance to themselves and the Church at large; there must have been a universal tradition to that effect. But there was no *consensus* at all. Mr. Wilberforce acknowledges four different lines of interpretation, and no one of them is his own. For what Mr. Wilberforce requires is that they should regard the Church as built upon Peter as the vicar and representative of his Master. On the contrary *all* those writers who regard the Church as built upon Peter at all, consider it built upon him as the representative of his fellow Apostles, upon whom it was equally built, in accordance with Eph. ii. 20, and Rev. xxi. 14, 27.

But Mr. Wilberforce triumphantly asserts, that 'every ante-'Nicene writer who refers to the passage supposes that reference 'is made to the *person* of S. Peter' (p.113). 'Every ante-Nicene writer' sounds authoritative. It calls up in our minds the thought of Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, Irenæus, Tatian, Theophilus, Athenagoras, Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, Lactantius, Arnobius, Dionysius of Alexandria, Gregory Thau-

Digitized by Google

maturgus, and other well-known names. Are these the authorities to which Mr. Wilberforce refers? No, not one of them. The persons whom he means are Tertullian, Hippolytus, S. Cyprian, Stephen, S. Firmilian, and Origen. These are all he claims in the above high-sounding sentence, and not one of them favours his view. Tertullian thus explains what *he* meant by 'supposing that reference was made to the *person* of S. Peter':—'On him the Church is built, that is, by his means: he is the 'first to use the key: and you see what key he used: "Ye men 'of Israel, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved 'of God among you," &c. Acts ii. 22.'[1] Then Tertullian understood by the text under discussion, that S. Peter should preach the first sermon, and so make the first converts. Is that of any use to Mr. Wilberforce?

Hippolytus is speaking of the Holy Spirit: 'This is the Spirit 'who at first moved upon the face of the waters ... who ener-'gized in the Prophets, who descended by flight upon Christ. 'This is the Spirit that was given to the Apostles in the appear-'ance of fiery tongues. By this Spirit Peter spoke those 'blessed words, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living 'God." By this Spirit the Rock of the Church was made firm. 'This is that Paraclete,' &c. The original of the last sentence is Διὰ τούτου τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐστερεώθη ἡ Πέτρα τῆς Ἐκκλησίας: and in Latin, 'Per hunc Spiritum firmata Ecclesiæ Petra est.'[2] Mr. Wilberforce says, that in this passage 'Hippolytus 'calls S. Peter "the Rock of the Church."' It is possible that he might have meant S. Peter by 'the Rock of the Church,' but he might equally well have meant something else. The interpretation 'By this Spirit the Church's Rock was made firm, *i.e.* the Church was made firm as a Rock,' is perhaps the better of the two; but if he does mean S. Peter, he evidently, as we see from the previous sentence, would regard him as the Rock, not as representing, but as confessing Christ.

S. Cyprian, we have already shown to hold that every bishop is as much a successor of S. Peter as the Bishop of Rome, and that S. Peter received nothing—neither power nor honour—which the other Apostles did not receive.

Of Stephen's opinion we know nothing, except what we learn from the following extract from S. Firmilian, who is himself likewise cited as a witness. We give his testimony:—

'What sort of error this man [Stephen, Bishop of Rome] is guilty of, and how great is his blindness in saying that remission of sin can be given in the assemblies of heretics, and in not standing firm on the foundation of the one Church which once has been compacted by Christ upon a rock,

[1] Tertull. de Pudic. c. 21, Op. p. 807. Parisiis, 1646.
[2] Hippolytus in Theophan. 9. Gallandi, vol. ii. 494.

Digitized by Google

may be understood from hence, that Christ said to Peter only, "Whatever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven;" and in the Gospel Christ breathed on the Apostles only, and said, "Receive the Holy Ghost; whose sins ye remit, they are remitted to them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained;" *therefore* power of remitting sin was given to *the Apostles*, and to *the Churches* which they, being sent by Christ, established, and to *the Bishops* who have succeeded them one after another by ordination in their place (*vicariâ ordinatione*). But the enemies of the one Catholic Church to which we belong, the adversaries of us who have succeeded to the Apostles, while they claim to themselves unlawful priesthoods against us, and erect profane altars, what are they else than Korahs, Dathans, and Abirams, equally wicked and sacrilegious, and to be punished like them, together with their abettors, even as at that time all who took part with those men, and favoured them, perished just as they did? And I do well to be angry with this so open and manifest folly of Stephen, that a man who boasts, as he does, about the place of his Bishopric, and contends that he holds the succession of Peter, upon whom the foundations of the Church were laid, is introducing many other rocks, and new edifices of many Churches, by giving his authority to the possibility of baptisms being performed in them. For those who are baptized make up, without doubt, the numbers of the Church; and he who approves of their baptism declares that there too there is a Church of the baptized. And he does not see that the true Christian rock (*Christianæ petræ veritatem*) is obscured, and in a way utterly destroyed, by him, in thus betraying and deserting unity.'—*S. Firm. Ep. ad S. Cyp. c.* xii.

Here S. Firmilian asserts the direct contrary to the two things which Mr. Wilberforce requires. He says that the Bishop of Rome was not the head and centre of unity, but, on the contrary, that he was betraying and deserting unity by leaving the one real Rock of the Church. Could he have said that, if he had taught that the Bishop of Rome was himself the Rock of the Church, and that to be in unity with him was to be in unity with the Church? He gives the reason, too, why, as he believed, Christ spoke to Peter alone in one place, and to the Apostles alone in the other. Does he say, then, that it was for the purpose of making S. Peter his special Vicar? On the contrary, he supposes that the intention was to show that the power of remitting sins was not given to heretics and schismatics, but only to *the Apostles*, to *the Bishops* their successors, and to *the Churches* established by them. Not an atom of authority or dignity does he see bestowed on S. Peter.

The other ante-Nicene authority is Origen. He calls S. Peter 'that great foundation of the Church, and most solid Rock on 'which Christ has founded his Church.' He does: and he likewise says—

'*If we confess like Peter* (flesh and blood not having revealed it to us, but light from our Father which is in heaven having shone into our hearts,) *we too become that which Peter was*, and we equally receive the title of "blessed" with him, because the reason why he was called "blessed" exists in our case too, viz. that flesh and blood has not revealed to us about

Digitized by Google

Jesus being the Christ, the Son of the living God, but our Father which is in heaven, from heaven itself, that we may have our conversation in heaven. . . . And if we too become Peter after having spoken like Peter, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," (flesh and blood not having revealed it to us, but light from our Father which is in heaven having shone into our hearts,) to us also there will be said by the Word, "Thou art Peter," &c. for every disciple of Christ is a rock. . . . But if you think that upon *that* one Peter only the whole Church was built by God, what will you say about John the son of thunder, and every one of the Apostles?" &c.—*Hom. in Matt.* xvi. 18. vol. iii. p. 524.

So Origen counts the Church to be built upon every sound Churchman as much as upon S. Peter.

But perhaps the method of dealing with S. Augustine is more disingenuous still. Every one knows that the doctrine of S. Augustine, enforced again and again throughout his works, is, that Christ Himself is the Rock, and that upon Him Peter, the representative of the Church, is built. S. Augustine saw four terms, as it were—the Rock: the Church: our Lord: Peter. Our Lord is himself the Rock, and upon Him Peter—*i. e.* all members of the Church are built. His doctrine with regard to the keys is the same. We will give one specimen:—

'Peter in many places of Scripture evidently represents the Church, especially in the place where it is said, "I will give to you the keys of the kingdom of heaven," &c. Did Peter receive these keys and Paul not receive them? Did Peter receive them, and John and James, and the rest of the Apostles, not receive them? Or are not these keys in the Church, where sins are daily remitted? But since what was meant was that Peter was representing the Church, what was given to him only was given to the Church.'—*Serm.* 149, tom. v. p. 802. *Ed. Migne.*

S. Augustine in this, and numberless other passages, regards S. Peter as the representative, sometimes of Christians in their several capacities, sometimes of the collective body of Christians—*i. e.* the Church: 'that He might be the Head, and the other represent the body, that is, the Church' (Serm. 46, 30). But Mr. Wilberforce's argument requires that he should not represent the body, but the head. How is S. Augustine to be made to say what he ought? First his words are forced into meaning that the Church is 'in its chief Bishop,' a sense no more conveyed by S. Augustine's words than Christ's being in Moses is asserted, when it is said that Moses represented Christ, or the Gentiles being in Cornelius is asserted, when it is said that he was the representative of the Gentiles. But this does not go far enough,—it is a step, because 'represented by' has become converted into 'included in;' but yet it is only a step. So one 'Hilary the deacon as it seems,' is brought in to bridge over the abyss. 'Hilary the deacon as it seems,' says that 'as 'the Apostles were all included in our Saviour by virtue of his

Digitized by Google

'office, so after our Saviour they are all included in Peter' (p. 115). Now, let us count up the steps. S. Augustine teaches that S. Peter, as representing others, was to be built upon Christ Himself (Serm. 761),—that S. Peter represented the Church which was to be built upon Him, the Rock. If S. Peter represented the Church, says Mr. Wilberforce, the Church was included in him, and 'Hilary the deacon as it seems,' says that the Church was included in Christ: then S. Peter was in this respect like Christ, viz.: that the Church was included in both of them; then Peter was the representative of Christ. *Q. E. D.* Mr. Wilberforce stops there. It follows, likewise, by necessary consequence, that Peter had to be built upon himself, and was both the foundation and superstructure of the Church. But who is this 'Hilary the deacon as it seems?' We know who Hilary the deacon was. He was a contemporary of Bishop Damasus. But who is 'Hilary the deacon *as it seems?*' (p. 115),—'Hilary the deacon *apparently?*' (p. 116). The Benedictine editors tell us. The authority to which Mr. Wilberforce has thus referred, is the writer of a supposititious work entitled 'Questions out of the Old and New Testaments,' which had become inserted amongst the works of S. Augustine, and was rejected by the Benedictines as spurious. The author, they say, denied original sin, held Melchizedek to be the Holy Ghost, was a Pelagian, and an Arian. The matter, and manner, and style of his teaching, they assert to be, altogether 'abhorrent to the holy Doctor's mind 'and faith; and, in fine, there are very few questions in the book 'which, one way or another, are not contradictory to S. Augus-'tine's doctrine.' This is the authority which Mr. Wilberforce calls in to reconcile S. Augustine's theory with his theory.

There is yet another misrepresentation in connexion with S. Augustine:—

'The pointedness of our Lord's words were diminished by their transfusion (*sic*) from his own Syriac into the Greek idiom . . . . . In Syriac it appears from the present Peschito version, the term in each member of the sentence is identical. Had St. Augustine, for instance, known that our Lord's words were—Thou art Cepho, and on this Cepho I will build my Church, he would not have employed the argument which he does in his Retractations. For after stating that he had *often* applied the passage to the person of Peter, as he had learned to do from a hymn of St. Ambrose, he adds, as a second interpretation which *might* be given, that "the rock was Christ." And so Peter, named from this rock, would represent the person of the Church, which is founded on this rock, and has received the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And then he proceeds on the reasons for giving such an interpretation. "For it was not said to him, Thou art Petra, but, Thou art Petrus." Now, of this distinction between the masculine and feminine words, the original Syriac affords no trace. . . . He has no objections to make against the interpretation which he had traditionally received, save one which arises from the imperfect manner in which the Greek language expresses our Lord's words.'—Pp. 113—115.

Digitized by Google

Now, what does S. Augustine say?

'I said in a certain place about the Apostle Peter, that the Church was founded upon him as upon a rock, a meaning which is also chanted by many voices in some verses of blessed Ambrose, where he says about the cock—"On its crowing, the very rock of the Church washed away his guilt." But I know that I have *very often* afterwards expounded our Lord's words as signifying that the Church was founded upon Him whom Peter confessed, saying, "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God;" and thus that Peter (rockman), having received his appellation from this Petra (rock), would represent the Church, which is built upon this Petra (rock), and which has received the keys of the kingdom of Heaven. For it is not said to him, Thou art Petra (a rock), but, Thou art Petrus (a rockman); but Christ was the Rock, and when Simon confessed Him, just as the whole Church confesses Him, he was called Peter (a rockman). Let the reader choose whichever of these two opinions is most probable.'—*S. Augustine, Retract.* 1. 21. 1, tom. i. p. 618.

After the specimens which we have had of Mr. Wilberforce's inaccuracies in his quotations, it is scarcely worth while to pause for the purpose of pointing out that it is not true, as here he asserts, that S. Augustine says that he had '*often* applied the 'passage to the person of Peter,' and that 'he adds as a second 'interpretation which *might be given*, that the Rock was Christ.' He distinctly says, that he *only once* so applied the passage, and *that* once he now places in his Retractations. And the other interpretation he does not introduce as one which *might be given*, but one which he had *very often* given,—in fact, in every passage except in this one early-written letter against Donatus, which has now perished;[1] nor is it 'the interpretation that he had traditionally received' to which he 'objects,' but an interpretation founded on a poetical expression in one of S. Ambrose's hymns, whereas elsewhere S. Ambrose explains that '*the rock* is Christ,' though he allows that every Christian may become *a rock* by faith, for 'faith is the foundation of the Church; and not of the 'flesh, but of the faith, of Peter, was it said, The gates of hell 'shall not prevail against it; his Confession conquered hell.'[2] But suppose that S. Augustine had used both interpretations commonly, does not the very declaration that the adoption of one or the other is indifferent, show that he did not lay any stress upon the personal reference to S. Peter as involving doctrine? Whereas Mr. Wilberforce sees in it 'an elementary portion of the Gospel revelation,' and compares it in that respect to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity (p. 105).

The argument from the Syriac Mr. Wilberforce brings forward as boldly as though it had never before been advanced

[1] Serm. 76, c. i. tom. 5, p. 479; Serm. 295, c. i. p. 1348; Serm. 244, § i. p. 1147; Serm. 270, § 2, p. 1239; Serm. 149, p. 802; are all selected from one volume of Abbé Migne's edition of S. Augustine, in Papal Supremacy, &c. p. 46.

[2] S. Ambr. tom. iv. p. 143, and tom. vi. p. 494.

Digitized by Google

and refuted. We repeat the refutation of a repeated misstatement:—

'To evade the force of the words *Upon this rock*, the Papists, Bellarmine Maldonate, Petrus de Bollo, and others, object it was not the Greek, but the Syriac language, wherein our Saviour spoke these words to Peter; in which language כיפא signifies both Peter and a stone, without any change of gender. To which I answer—1. It is true our Saviour spoke these words, not in the Greek but Syriac language; but, howsoever, S. Matthew wrote them not in Syriac, but in Greek, and therefore it is the Greek that is the original, not the Syriac. But, 2, *it is plainly false* that כיפא signifies both Peter and a stone, *without the change of the gender*, or in the same gender, for that כיפא, as it denotes Peter, is of the masculine gender, I hope they will not deny..... whereas כיפא, for a stone or rock, is always of the feminine, as "Jacob accepit Cepha et erexit *eam*."—(Gen. xxxi. 45.) So "Cepha probat*a* angularis pretios*a*" (Is. xxviii. 16); "Cepha magn*a* erat" (Mar. xvi. 4); and so elsewhere. Nay, 3, *in this very place* too כיפא, when spoken of Peter, whose name it was, is of the masculine, but when used for a rock or stone is of the feminine gender: סלע הזו כיפא "et super *hanc* Cepha," not "*hunc*:" for thus it should have been הזה, not הזו, which is a pronoun of the feminine gender. And therefore it is in vain to seek any elusion of the place from the Syriac, that being as plain against them as the Greek; for as in the Greek *πέτρος* and *πέτρα* are of different genders, so are the first and second כיפא in Syriac of different genders too.'—*Beveridge on Art.* XXXVII., vol. vii. p. 582, Oxf., 1845.

Before leaving this text we will in a few words sum up the interpretations which have been given to it. By some the Rock is supposed to mean Christ; this is the interpretation of S. Augustine, S. Ambrose, S. Gregory, S. Jerome, Bede, &c. According to some it means the Faith and consequent Confession of S. Peter: this is the view of S. Chrysostom, S. Cyril of Alexandria, S. Hilary, S. Gregory Nyssen, S. Ambrose,[1] S. Gregory the Great, Theodoret, Theophylact, Ælfric,[2] &c. Some take it to mean S. Peter, as representing the other Apostles: this is the interpretation of S. Basil, S. Cyprian, S. Firmilian, S. Jerome. Some hold that it means S. Peter as representing all sound Churchmen: this is Origen's explanation. Some consider S. Peter to be meant as having been the first and great instrument of converting the Jews to Christianity on the day of Pentecost, opening the door to the Gentiles in the person of Cornelius, and teaching the mysteries of the faith; this is the view of Tertullian, Epiphanius, &c., and is

[1] It will be seen that sometimes the same Fathers give in different places different interpretations. Not considering that any special doctrine was involved, they naturally drew as many edifying lessons as they were able from the words.

[2] A Trans-Atlantic contemporary, in an able article on 'The Question of the Papacy,' states that 'Thirty-five of the ancient Fathers are reckoned as holding the opinion, that S. Peter's confession is the Rock. To these must be added at least six of the early Popes; while the exposition is also recognised in a prayer in the Missal of the Roman Church, in the Mass for the Vigil of S. Peter and S. Paul, which, referring to this text, has the expression, "the rock of the apostolical confession."'—Church Review, New Haven, Conn., Oct. 1854, p. 388.

Digitized by Google

supported by Mr. Alford in his Commentary. Every one of these views is tenable, and finds support among the writers and Fathers of the Church. Mr. Wilberforce's view, on the other hand, that S. Peter is the Rock, as specially representing Christ (*i. e.* as His special vicar) is untenable, and is not supported by a single Father, or a single early writer, unless a sentence may perhaps be so construed, which is found in the writings of a Pelagian and Arian heretic, 'Hilary the deacon as it seems.'

5. and 6. The fifth proof may be passed over very summarily, for Mr. Wilberforce does not bring forwards a single authority for his interpretation of Luke xxii. 31, 'Simon, Simon, Satan hath desired,' &c. except his friend 'Hilary the deacon apparently.' We prefer the consentient exposition of antiquity, which teaches that the meaning of the text is, that our Lord prayed that Peter might not fall away from the grace of God in the trials which were coming upon him. In the sixth we desiderate Bellarmine's notable explanation of *ποίμαινε μοῦ τὰ πρόβατα*—'Rule as king over Jews, Gentiles, and Bishops,' and find two passages, one from S. Chrysostom, that 'Jesus putteth into his hands the chief authority [*προστασία*, first place] among the brethren,' and one from *Saint* Optatus. With regard to the first, had Mr. Wilberforce looked on a few verses further, he would have found that, according to S. Chrysostom, the world was entrusted just as much to S. John as to S. Peter—and had he looked in the previous volume of S. Chrysostom's works, he would have seen, that so far from regarding the words, 'Feed my sheep,' as addressed in any special manner to S. Peter, the saint says, 'This is addressed not only to priests but to every one of us: 'each one of us has a sheep to conduct to its right pasturage.'[1]

With regard to *Saint* Optatus, first, we have to say that he is not a *saint*, and secondly, that the passage which Mr. Wilberforce has quoted is most likely a forgery. The method by which Optatus became sainted is the following:—When Baronius was drawing up his edition of the Roman Martyrology, he found that Peter Natalis had made a confusion between Optatus, Bishop of Antissiodorus, and Optatus, Bishop of Milevis; and whereas it was Optatus of Antissiodorus' festival, which fell upon August 31, Peter Natalis had substituted Optatus of Milevis. Baronius rectified the mistake: but what was he to do with the Bishop of Milevis? After he had once been admitted to the catalogue, it was hard to dismiss him so rudely, and his writings (being largely interpolated) were useful for strengthening the Papal claims: so Baronius kindly found him a place on June 4, and thus Optatus became a saint. The passage quoted by Mr.

[1] Tom. vii. p. 785, Ed. Bened., 1727. Papal Supremacy, &c. p. 44.

Digitized by Google

Wilberforce is taken from the seventh book of Optatus' work against the Donatists, the whole of which book is generally considered a forgery. S. Jerome says that Optatus wrote only six books. Optatus says that he was only going to write six books: the seventh very often contradicts the six others, and its style is totally different.

Such are Mr. Wilberforce's 'proofs' from the Gospels. We shall not occupy our space in dwelling on the counter-balancing statements, such as S. John's, and S. James', and S. Paul's, special privileges, which might be counted up in the same manner as S. Peter's; the equality of the twelve thrones in S. Matt. xix. 27; the request of Zebedee's children in S. Matt. xx. 20; the unmonarchical character of his kingdom in S. Mark x. 42; the disputing among the disciples for superiority in S. Luke xxii. 24; the special words of reproof as well as of honour addressed to S. Peter, and the rest of the passages which might be referred to. We are not careful to linger over this point, for we are persuaded that Englishmen, who have all their lives been accustomed to the Scriptures, will never be induced to believe that any special vicariate of S. Peter is taught in them, unless they find that there is a universal consensus of the Doctors of the early Church to the effect that certain texts are to be interpreted as testimony of that vicariate. We have shown that there is a universal consensus against that interpretation.

In the Acts and Epistles we have six more points brought forward. These will not detain us long. 1. '*In the first portion* '*of the book* which describes the actions of all the Apostles, 'S. Peter is so entirely prominent that his position *might almost* 'be compared with that which our Lord Himself while upon 'earth occupied towards his disciples' (p. 122). We reply, '*In the latter portion of the book* S. Paul is so entirely prominent that his position might equally well be compared with that of our Lord's.' 2. It is Peter who works the miracles of healing the lame man; it is Peter who condemns Simon Magus, Ananias and Sapphira; it is Peter who admits the Gentiles. We reply, it is Paul who raises Eutychus; it is Paul who condemns Elymas, and casts out the spirit of divination; it was Paul who had the Apostleship of the Gentiles; and it was the Church in Synod assembled which sanctioned their admission. 3. 'At the Council of Jerusalem the ancient writers see no sign 'that S. Peter was wanting in authority' (p. 125). In proof several passages of S. Chrysostom are quoted. (1) 'Great 'effrontery this of the Pharisees, that even after faith they set up 'the law and will not obey *the Apostles.*'[1] What has this to

[1] S. Chrys. Hom. in Act. xxxii. 2

Digitized by Google

do with S. Peter? (2) 'Observe he first permits the question 'to be moved in the Church, and then speaks.' (Ibid.) On which Mr. Wilberforce comments, 'He refers especially to 'S. Peter as having *allowed* the discussion to have its course, 'and having then *stepped in with authority.*' Mr. Wilberforce represents it an act of condescension. S. Chrysostom is speaking of it as an act which showed his wisdom—he let the complainants speak first: then, and not till then, he replied, and 'advanced gradually' to the point which he wished to prove—there is nothing whatever about stepping in with special authority. (3) 'Our Lord putteth into S. Peter's hands the chief 'authority (position) *among* his brethren,' *i. e.* he was *primus inter pares*, except in the diocese specially appointed to one—a thing which we do not dispute. (4) 'He asks the question, '"How then did James receive the chair at Jerusalem?" His 'answer is that Christ "appointed Peter teacher not of the chair 'but of the world"' (p. 126). Was it fair in Mr. Wilberforce to quote this comment on John xxi. 19 without adding that on John xxi. 23 S. Chrysostom says that S. John was 'to receive 'the charge of the world' equally with S. Peter? And that elsewhere he speaks of S. Paul as 'an Apostle of the world,—'charged with the care of cities, and peoples, and nations, nay, 'of the whole world,—the planter of the Church,—the tongue 'of the world, the light of the Churches, the foundation of the 'faith, the pillar and ground of the truth'—who 'excelled all 'men who have been since men first were?'[1] (5) Mr. Wilberforce says that according to Chrysostom, the reason why S. James closes the discussion is, that he was Bishop of Jerusalem, but that there is nothing in this circumstance which implies him to have been superior to S. Peter. Would it not have been well to have given S. Chrysostom's words here as well as in all the other passages? They are as follow:—'James restrains himself and 'does not leap up; for it was he that was invested with the chief 'rule (*τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐγκεχειρισμένος*). No word speaks John 'here, no word the other Apostles, but hold their peace; and 'they think it no hardship, so clean was their soul from the love 'of glory . . . *Peter, indeed, spoke at the beginning more strongly, but 'James speaks more mildly, for thus it behoves one in high authority '—(ἐν μεγάλῃ δυναστείᾳ) to leave what is unpleasant for others 'to say, while he himself appears in the milder part.*'[2]

4. 'In the Epistle to the Corinthians, where S. Paul often 'mentions S. Peter's name, the order observed *always* points out

[1] S. Chrys. in Ep. 1. ad Cor. ix. 2. In Ep. 2 ad Cor. xi. 28. Hom. de Fil. Zeb. Or. 1, in Rom. xvi. 3. De Laud. S. Pauli, Or. 2. We have taken these five references from Mr. Scudamore's 'England and Rome,' p. 151, an able, useful, and learned book, written calmly, and, what is of great price, fairly.

[2] S. Chrys. Hom. in Act. Apost. xxxiii. Op., tom. ix. p. 255.

Digitized by Google

'his priority' (p. 126). We might answer, 'In the Epistle to the Galatians, where S. Paul mentions S. Peter's name, the order observed points out no priority, for it is placed between James and John.' We might also answer, that in two out of the four places in the Epistle to the Corinthians in which it is used, it does not naturally point out any priority; and we might further add, that a position of priority would be what we should expect on the hypothesis of S. Peter being *primus inter pares:* this, then, is nothing in favour of Mr. Wilberforce.

5. 'When S. Paul speaks of going up "to see Peter," they 'all understand this to be a mark of respect, paid by one whom 'our Lord had added to their number by immediate appoint-'ment, to the chief of the Apostles' (p. 187). Those quoted are Tertullian, Marius Victorinus, Hilary the Deacon, S. Jerome, S. Chrysostom, and Theodoret. The quotation from Tertullian is irrelevant, and its apparent application rests on the misunderstanding of one of the words.[1] Hilary the Deacon (this is not 'Hilary the Deacon, *as it seems*,' though it is still doubtful whether it is the genuine Hilary) does not represent S. Paul as being in an analogous position towards the Churches of the Gentiles as S. Peter towards the whole Church, according to Mr. Wilberforce's statement, and he is only made to appear to do so by half-sentences being quoted. Had the whole passage been fairly given, it would have been seen that he places S. Paul upon an exact equality with S. Peter, the latter holding the primacy amongst the Apostles of the circumcision, and the former holding the primacy amongst the Apostles of the uncircumcision. 'So, however, that Peter might preach to the Gentiles if there were cause, and Paul to the Jews: for they are both found to 'have done so. But still in preaching to the Jews full authority 'is distinguished as given to Peter, and the authority of Paul 'in preaching to the Gentiles is found perfect.' And again: 'that he (Paul) should be thought worthy to have the primacy 'in preaching to the Gentiles, as Peter had in preaching to the 'circumcision.' The 'Apostles' amongst whom S. Peter has the primacy are only *Apostoli circumcisionis*, and S. Paul holds the same position amongst the *Apostoli gentium*. If anything, a higher station is assigned to S. Paul than to S. Peter, for he says: 'Each of them received his dispensation in proportion to 'his strength; for it was more difficult to attract to the faith 'and convince those who were far away from God, than those 'who were very near.'[2] These are words which Mr. Wilberforce

[1] 'Ascendit Hierosolymam, cognoscendi Petri causâ, ex officio et jure scilicet ejusdem fidei et prædicationis.' De Præscript. c. xxiv. *Ex officio* cannot mean 'as a matter of duty' towards S. Peter.

[2] App. in S. Ambr. tom. ii. p. 216.

Digitized by Google

not only fails to quote, but he omits them although making part of the passage from which he has extracted certain portions of two sentences.

The other authorities, while they show themselves irreconcileably opposed to Bellarmine's dictum, that S. Paul, and all the other Apostles, received their jurisdiction, mission, and ordination from S. Peter, do not go beyond what we should expect them to say, on the hypothesis that S. Peter was *primus inter pares.* Mr. Wilberforce, having made his extracts from them, concludes thus: 'These writers, then, attributed to S. Paul an immediate 'and independent commission from our Lord, such as he bestowed 'on all the Apostles; but they represent him to have recognised '*that priority of S. Peter which was designed to secure the unity of* '*the Apostolic body.*' We repeat, that that priority 'which was designed to secure the unity of the Apostolic body,' is a thing totally different in kind from that priority which made S. Peter first amidst his brethren. The latter, S. Chrysostom and others did recognise; the former, is wholly unknown to them.

6. When S. Peter was rebuked by S. Paul, Mr. Wilberforce thinks that the latter's act was that of an inferior. We leave that point to our readers' judgment.

Again, we shall not linger over the counterbalancing statements. They are well known: the appointment of S. Matthias; the appointment of the deacons; S. Peter and S. John being sent by the Apostles; S. James presiding and giving sentence in the Council of Jerusalem; S. Peter recognising S. Paul's apostolate of the Gentiles, and withdrawing himself into the ministration of the Gospel of the circumcision; the reproof of S. Peter by S. Paul; S. Paul's vindication of his independent and equal authority; S. Paul's declaration that on him came 'daily the care of all the Churches'—a form of speech assumed to themselves in later times by the Bishops of Rome, and which would doubtless have been brought forward as an irrefragable proof of the Supremacy, if only S. Peter had used it instead of S. Paul—the expressions employed by S. Peter himself in his Epistles; the exact equality, according to measurement, of the twelve foundations of the 'great city, the holy Jerusalem,' 'the bride, the Lamb's wife,' which had 'on them the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb:' these are some of the special passages bearing on the point; but the great proof is the spirit and tone which pervades the whole of the Sacred Writings.

We submit that Mr. Wilberforce has not made out his first point; he has not shown that S. Peter was head and centre of unity to the Apostles, as our Lord's representative after His departure hence; that he has vainly attempted to fasten that

Digitized by Google

doctrine upon S. Cyprian, S. Augustine, and other great Doctors of the Church; that he has vainly attempted to find it in Scripture, and can get no early writer to agree with him, except one Arian and Pelagian heretic, who thought Melchizedek was the Holy Ghost. On the contrary, we maintain that the powers and the commissions of all the Apostles were exactly equal; that this is witnessed to by Scripture, and held universally in the early Church; that there is not one early writer, with the exception possibly of Optatus and S. Jerome (whose words we shall presently examine), who supposed that S. Peter had any peculiar office of securing unity; that there is not one, except the Arian heretic above mentioned, who regarded him as a special representative of his Master; and that there is, in truth, no *special* 'Vicar of Christ on Earth,'[1] except the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, whom Christ promised to send in His own place, (John xiv. 16,) and who is the Bond of Unity to His Church.[2]

II. We proceed to the second point. The bishop of Rome was not the head and centre of unity to the early Church.

We have seen that the main argument of Mr. Wilberforce heretofore has rested on the ambiguity of the word 'Primacy'. Sometimes S. Peter's 'primacy' is a certain 'superiority' (p. 142), 'his prominence' (p. 124), 'a certain primacy *in* the college of the Apostles' (p. 110), he is 'the first Apostle' (p. 116), 'the chief Apostle' (p. 121). Now, substitute Bishop for Apostle, and it will be seen that we might give all those titles to the Bishop of London. Such a primacy as that we are ready to admit; the earliest ecclesiastical historian says that he did 'take the lead of

[1] Mr. Wilberforce acknowledges (p. 99), that the principle of the *Ancient* Church was, that *every* Bishop 'represented the person of Christ, and was Christ's Vicar, the Father of the people (*papa*);' which would necessarily exclude the later Papal notion. Mr. Wilberforce incorrectly quotes the words, 'Christ's Vicar,' as though they were S. Ambrose's; they are Hilary the Deacon's, who says that a Bishop, like a Judge, is *Vicarius Domini*, the Vicar or Representative of his Lord.—App. S. Ambr. ii. 148.

[2] So Tertullian, De Præscript. Hæret. c. xxviii. 'Spiritus Sanctus, ad hoc missus à Christo, ad hoc postulatus de Patre, ut esset doctor veritatis . . . *Dei Villicus, Christi Vicarius.*' Thus too, Bishop Andrewes: 'Belong ye then to your Roman Catholic Church, a thing not found in the Creed, and we to that in which we believe, —a Church which is simply Catholic, not restricted to Rome, but such as we profess in the Creed—a Church which is orthodox; which does not bow down to or worship any image (Exod. xx. 4); which does not worship it knows not what (John iv. 2); which bids all drink from Christ's cup (Matt. xxvii. 27); which prays in the spirit, and prays with the understanding likewise (1 Cor. xiv. 15); which does not call on them on whom it believes not (Rom. x. 4); in which *Christ is the Head of the Faith, and the Holy Spirit His Vicar* (John xvi. 7). To this we belong, and profess to belong: and you, since you have many of the doctrines of the Catholic Faith still remaining among you, though in part corrupted, we are able to call members of the Catholic Church, but not sound members.'—Tortura Torti, p. 495. In the same manner, King James I. '*Christus Ecclesiæ suæ monarcha est, Christique vices explet, quem venturum promiserat, Spiritus Sanctus.*'—Præf. Mon. in Apol. pro Jur. Fidel.

Digitized by Google

the rest,' and he tells us the reason, 'on account of his courage;'[1] and such a primacy as that is admitted by many, not by all—it was an indifferent matter—of the early Christian writers. But by-and-by this harmless preeminence designated by the word 'Primacy,' becomes a very different thing. Now it is the 'peculiar and characteristic commission given to S. Peter by our Lord' (p. 117), 'it is the peculiar provision made for securing the unity of the Apostles' (p. 118), it makes S. Peter 'the centre of unity' (p. 119), it gives him a peculiar 'office' (p. 138), it 'associates him to our Lord's own office' (p. 140), it 'associates him, by peculiar copartnership, in one of the functions of 'his Master, and makes him become, by grace, that which Christ 'was by nature' (p. 112), it makes him 'the especial representative (vicar) of Christ' (p. 112), and the Fathers who have allowed the first-described 'Primacy' are cited as having acknowledged the last (p. 128).

The next step is likewise grounded on an ambiguity. Are the Bishops of Rome S. Peter's successors? Yes; S. Irenæus says that they are successors of SS. Peter and Paul (p. 134), S. Cyprian says that they succeeded S. Peter (p. 136), Tertullian says that Clement was appointed by S. Peter (p. 136), S. Augustine asserts that from Linus to Anastasius they all succeeded S. Peter (p. 141). But how did they succeed? Of course as Bishops of Rome, just as Annianus and Avilius succeeded as Bishops of Alexandria, Evodius and Ignatius as Bishops of Antioch, and Symeon and Justus as Bishops of Jerusalem. But this succession *in the Roman episcopate* is wholly irrelevant: the question is, as Mr. Wilberforce fairly states it, had he any successors *in the Primacy?* Now, there is not a single one of these writers who have been quoted as witnesses 'that the Bishop of Rome is S. Peter's successor,' who gives the slightest hint that he meant that the Bishops of Rome succeeded S. Peter in any other capacity than as Bishops of Rome. They mention an historical fact, which may also be found in every historian from Eusebius to Dean Milman. But, says Mr. Wilberforce, 'Since the Church of Rome was spoken 'of in ancient times as the see of S. Peter, though S. Paul also 'was one of its founders, the commission transmitted by the 'other Apostle must surely have been characteristic and peculiar. For why should this Church have been so especially 'associated with the name of S. Peter, unless there was 'something specific in the commission which he transmitted' (p. 137)? So the proof of S. Peter's being succeeded by the Bishops of Rome in his (supposed) vicarial Primacy is, that the

[1] Τὸν καρτερὸν καὶ μέγαν τῶν ἀποστόλων, τὸν ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα τῶν λοιπῶν ἁπάντων προηγόρον, Πέτρον.—Euseb. ii. 14.

Digitized by Google

see of Rome came to be called the see of S. Peter instead of the see of S. Peter and S. Paul!—a slender thread on which to hang the weight of the Papacy. If it were true, would it not be fully accounted for by the very simple fact, that 'the see of S. Peter and S. Paul' is a lengthy expression, which would naturally have become shortened into 'the see of S. Peter?' It is not, however, universally true, for the Bishops of Rome are very often spoken of as successors to both the Apostles, and Eusebius places the name of S. Paul before that of S. Peter,[1] a fact which would more than counterbalance 'Dionysius of 'Corinth putting S. Peter first, as one of the two who had 'planted the Church at Corinth, and thereby associated it 'with Rome' (p. 137), if it were true that Dionysius had 'done so. But he has not. He says, 'You, too, by means 'of this admonition, have again united that which was planted 'by Peter and Paul *at Rome* and Corinth. For both of them 'having come to our Corinth and planted us, taught us alike, 'and having in like manner taught in Italy they suffered 'martyrdom about the same time.'[2] Whether Dionysius places the name of Peter before that of Paul, or of Paul before that of Peter, is about as unimportant a thing as could well be; but it is evident that he is there speaking not only of their preaching at Corinth, but, as he says, at Rome.

Mr. Wilberforce has another argument. He says that 'it may be objected,' that it was only the general Apostolic commission, not the peculiar Primatial commission, which was bestowed upon the Roman Bishops. This 'objection' he meets as follows:—

'It proceeds upon the supposition that St. Peter's power consisted of two portions, one of which expired with himself, while he handed on the other. Either, then, we ought to find some ancient statement that his functions were understood to be thus divided; or such an arrangement, though not expressed in words, must have been implied in the manner in which his office was dealt with. But neither of these suppositions is maintainable. Our Lord's promise of His continual presence, the conduct of the Apostles themselves, and the belief of their first disciples, had led the ancient Christians to the conclusion, that the commission bestowed upon the Twelve was given for the permanent guidance and administration of the Church. But nothing indicates that the commission of the other eleven was supposed to be more durable than his whom St. Matthew terms the First Apostle. No ancient Church-writer attempts to discriminate between his powers, and to show that the one part of them was merely personal, the other transferable.'—P. 135.

Mr. Wilberforce *does* himself hold this distinction of powers and functions in S. Peter—the general commission given him as an Apostle, and the peculiar commission given to him by our Lord (p. 117)—the Apostolic and the Primatial authority (p. 135)—

[1] Euseb. ii. 25; iii. 21. [2] Euseb. ii. 25.

Digitized by Google

his ordinary commission as an Apostle, and his office of Primate (p. 138). Starting with this assumption, he here argues that unless ancient Church writers discriminate between these *powers*, and show that one part of them was merely personal, the other transferable, it is reasonable to suppose that they believed them to be both transferable, and that they were accordingly transferred. But there is one good reason, we think, why ancient Church writers should not have done so; and that is, that they none of them recognised or believed in 'this peculiar commission,' this 'Primatial *authority*,' this '*office* of Primate.' They all regarded S. Peter as having received the same commission, authority, and office with the rest of the Apostles, and none other: as S. Cyprian says, '*the other Apostles were that which Peter was; endowed with an equal fellowship* (pari consortio) *both of honour and power*.'[1] The primacy which some of them admitted was no *power* or *office* at all but a *prominence*. As, therefore, they did not hold that S. Peter had peculiar powers, it is not likely that they would have gone out of their way to say that those peculiar powers, of which they were totally unaware, were not transferred to Linus. Yet, says Mr. Wilberforce, unless they do so, we ought in reason to believe that it was. He acknowledges that it was only '*in later times*' that 'it has been '*found convenient* to discriminate the several ideas which were 'involved in S. Peter's office, and to point out what was peculiar 'to himself, what common to his brethren .... That which is 'common to all Bishops has *since* been called the power of 'Order, and Mission has been the name given to that authority 'which arranges when, how, and where the power of Order 'shall be used' (p. 135). He does not tell us *when* it was thus 'found convenient to discriminate' these several ideas. Mr. Allies supplies the deficiency.

'But when this fraud (the Decretals) was discovered, the defenders of the Pope's unlimited power, the great school of S. Ignatius Loyola, set themselves with unexampled energy, skill, and unity of purpose, to build up the breach. Theirs are *those very clever but arbitrary divisions* which Mr. Thompson assumes to be the "Catholic faith," *i.e.* the separation of the Bishop's power into that of orders and that of jurisdiction, allowing that all Bishops are equal as to the first, but restricting the last to the Pope; the asserting that S. Peter's power was ordinary, but that of the Apostles extraordinary; that S. Peter had a successor to all his power, but the Apostles none to theirs; that the Bishops are successors of the Apostles only as to orders, not as to jurisdiction; that the Pope's jurisdiction comes from Christ immediately, but that of other Bishops from the Pope; that the Apostles were equal to each other in all points but one, viz. that the exercise of all their powers depended upon union with Peter, which totally destroyed their equality. These and such-like are very clever, but wholly

[1] De Unitat. i. Such passages might be multiplied *ad libitum*. See Scudamore's England and Rome, p. 140.

Digitized by Google

arbitrary, and, moreover, *ex post facto* defences of the plenitude of Papal power, which was really introduced by the belief of Western Europe in the authenticity of the false Decretals.'—Pref. p. xiv.

So we are to believe that the Early Fathers taught that an authority was transferred to Linus and his successors which did not exist, which they did not believe to exist, which they incidentally deny to have existed, and the clever arguments for the existence of which the Jesuits first invented in the sixteenth century, *because* they do not in so many words declare that such authority was *not* transferred. It might as reasonably be inferred that our forefathers were acquainted with the power of steam on the grounds that they have not written treatises to deny it.

It has been taught, and rightly taught, that all Bishops are successors of S. Peter equally with the Bishop of Rome, and it has been represented, and rightly represented, that this is S. Cyprian's doctrine.[1] Mr. Wilberforce sets himself to grapple with both these statements. 'Another expedient has been devised 'for neutralizing any peculiar claim which the Bishops of Rome 'might derive from S. Peter's commission—the assertion, namely, 'that all Bishops are equally his successors. The notion men-'tioned above was, that his successors at Rome inherited nothing 'but his ordinary commission as an Apostle: this would imply 'that his office of Primate was bequeathed to the whole Episco-'pate' (p. 138). It would imply no such thing, nor did those to whom Mr. Wilberforce attributes the 'devising' of 'the expedient' ever say so. They acknowledged no *office* of Primate; no *peculiar* commission to S. Peter. They regarded S. Peter as at one moment representing his brother Apostles exactly as Cornelius at one moment represented his brother Gentiles. All the successors of the Apostles, therefore, may be said to have succeeded to S. Peter, not in his 'Primatial office,' but in the episcopate, which they inherit from the Apostles, of whom S. Peter was then the representative. In opposition to this view, Mr. Wilberforce cites S. Cyprian's statement, that the foundations were laid in one 'to *manifest* unity'—'that the Church might be *set before us as* one.' This Mr. Wilberforce says must mean 'to *maintain* unity,' and that 'some *method*' was instituted 'by which the Apostles themselves might *be exempted* from division.' We have already pointed out this confusion of *manifesting* and *maintaining*, whereby a *lesson* is changed into an *instrument;* we therefore need no longer dwell upon it. But, continues Mr. Wilberforce, 'the other 'interpretation does not accord with the language of other 'writers who carried on S. Cyprian's argument.' Who are these 'other writers'? [S.] Optatus and S. Jerome. Can anything

[1] By the Editors of the 'Library of the Fathers.'

Digitized by Google

be purer eclecticism than to choose one noted passage of Optatus, and half of a passage of S. Jerome, and make them specimens of 'other writers,' whereas they are not specimens of others, when too the rest of the sentence in S. Jerome gives an entirely different complexion to his words, and internal evidence shows the passage from Optatus to be a forgery? Why were not S. Augustine and S. Pacian cited? They were the real inheritors of Cyprianism, and we have already shown that their teaching does accord with the interpretation of 'manifest' which we require; viz. that it means 'manifest,' and not something else. 'In vain' says Mr. Allies, 'does Mr. Thompson 'try to torture a passage or two of S. Cyprian into his view: 'in vain by resting exclusively on one or two expressions of '[S.] Optatus and others, and putting out of sight all that on 'the other side the Church did and spoke, does he try to give 'it the witness of antiquity' (Pref. p. xiii).

We have already shown how Optatus attained his name of *Saint*, and pointed out that Mr. Wilberforce has quoted a passage, from the forged seventh book, as though it had been genuine. This passage, which he now brings forward, or at least a part of it, is likewise forged; for in it Optatus is made to speak of Siricius as being Bishop of Rome, whereas Siricius did not become Pope till the year 384, and Optatus wrote in the year 370. We will, however, examine it, as though it were not forged. Optatus then, or the person who has borrowed his name, was writing against the Donatists. The Donatists had become schismatical, mainly from dwelling with overstrained earnestness upon one of the attributes of the Church. The Church they argued is holy: where, therefore, holiness is not, that cannot be the Church. Their adversaries, as was natural and right, dwelt upon the other two chief attributes of the Church—Unity and Catholicity. On the latter of these they used the same arguments against the Donatists which we are able to bring with so much force against the exclusiveness of the Roman portion of the Church now. Many of the arguments of Bishop Andrewes against Romanists are almost identical with those of Optatus against Donatists. On the former, they were led by their circumstances to look about them, to see if they could not find some tangible test by which with one argument they might close the mouths of their opponents. To persons in such a state of mind there might well have occurred the thought, that union with the great Western Patriarch would serve as such a test. He was on their side, and had earned the character of orthodoxy, and they could not then contemplate that the war for Truth's sake would ever turn against him who was now their champion. So they were disposed to urge the authority of

Digitized by Google

Rome, and to magnify his office by magnifying that of S. Peter. This was not done by the great and far-seeing minds of such as S. Augustine; but with lesser minds it is always a temptation to grasp at an argument which gives a momentary advantage over an adversary, without probing its truth to the quick, or looking to its consequences. There seems to be a tendency in that direction in this book against the Donatists. In the passage before us the writer is counting up the prerogatives of the orthodox Church in reply to his Donatist friend. 'There are,' he says, besides the Church's 'limbs and bowels,' 'which are without doubt in the sacraments and in the names of the Trinity' (ii. 10), five 'endowments,' *dotes*, which Mr. Wilberforce calls 'tokens.' These are (1) a chair, (2) an angel (or a ring), (3) the Spirit, (4) a fountain, (5) a seal. A sixth had been added; viz. (6) a navel; but this he denies to be one of the endowments. He then explains the chair:—

'You cannot deny that in the city of Rome on Peter first an episcopal chair was bestowed, in which sat Peter the head of all the Apostles, *whence also he was called Cephas;* in which one chair unity might be preserved by all, that the rest of the Apostles might not each maintain individual chairs, but that he might be at once schismatical and a sinner who set up another against this one chair. In the one chair, then, which is the first of the endowments, (not 'the first of tokens,') sat Peter first, to whom succeeded Linus, &c.; and to Damasus, Siricius, who is now our colleague, together with whom the whole world is joined with us in one fellowship of communion by the interchange of Letters of Communion. And now give an account of the origin of your chair, who wish to claim the holy Church to yourselves.'—*S. Opt.* ii. 2.

This is the one passage in all antiquity which comes nearest to what Mr. Wilberforce requires. We have to remark upon it, 1. that the writer is, as may be seen, very mystical, and his meaning is not easy to discover. 2. That he is also far from a learned man, for he derives *Cephas* from κεφαλή, or *caput*, (a derivation which Dupin justly calls 'of little solidity,' and Mr. Wilberforce, in quoting the passage p. 164, wisely omits, without, however, marking that he has done so). 3. That it is but a clumsy forgery, Siricius being fourteen years after the date of Optatus. 4. That the writer does not give a hint that he conceived S. Peter to be the special representative of his Master, and *in that sense* the centre of unity. But he does seem to consider that S. Peter had an office for the sake of preserving unity among the Apostles. And he and S. Jerome (as quoted below) were the only writers of antiquity that held even that.

S. Jerome is comparing the excellences of S. Peter and S. John—

'But you say that upon Peter the Church was founded, *though that same thing was done in another place upon all the Apostles*, and *all of them* receive

Digitized by Google

the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the strength of the Church is founded *upon them equally with him;* still, one is therefore chosen among the twelve, that by the appointment of a head occasion of schism may be taken away. But why was not John chosen, who was a virgin? Deference was paid to age, because Peter was the elder. Peter was an Apostle, and John was an Apostle, the first married, the second a virgin. But Peter was nothing else than an Apostle (*Apostolus tantum*); John was both an Apostle, and an Evangelist, and a Prophet,' &c.—*Adv. Jov.* i. p. 168.

There were, then, two writers in antiquity, Optatus (supposing that only a part, and not the whole, of the passage given above is forged) and S. Jerome, who apparently believed not only that S. Peter was prominent or chief *amongst* the Apostles, which is a very general view, but also that S. Peter had the office of head of the college for the sake of preserving unity among the Apostles. Grotius has maintained the same view, showing that it does not imply any very lofty idea of S. Peter's prerogative. But while Optatus and S. Jerome use this language, the first nowhere says, and the second distinctly denies, that he held this office as special representative of his Lord. Therefore their testimony is valueless to Mr. Wilberforce. It is this circumstance which would raise him to the position which none but his Master ought to fill, and where the Church of Rome and Mr. Wilberforce would fain place him.[1]

But further, 'S. Cyprian applies the term, *the place of Peter*, especially to the see of Rome' (p. 129). Doubtless. Constantine was Emperor of the Romans, consequently all after Emperors of the Romans were his successors: but Constantine might, if we chose, be looked upon as the symbol of Christian princes in general, then all Christian princes would be his successors. So S. Cyprian regarded Cornelius as the successor of S. Peter in one sense, and all Bishops as his successors in another.

The chapter that speaks of the Bishops of Rome as being S. Peter's successors, ends with two quotations from S. Augustine. In these quotations S. Augustine distinctly affirms, that the Roman Bishop contemporary with himself was S. Peter's successor. But did he mean in the local episcopate of Rome, or in the Primacy? If he meant the first, the passages are wholly irrelevant to the question in hand, and should not have been made use of. Did he, then, mean the Primacy—this vicarial Primacy, by virtue of which the Primate is the peculiar representative of Christ, and the instrument of securing unity

[1] S. Jerome is also quoted by Mr. Wilberforce, in p. 99, as 'noticing' that 'S. Peter's temporary occupation of the See of Antioch,' was 'the ground of its superiority.' The passage to which he gives a reference as his authority for this statement, is the following: 'Finally we have received that Peter was the first Bishop of the Church of Antioch, and was thence translated to Rome; which Luke has altogether omitted.'—Vol. iv. p. 244.

Digitized by Google

to the Church? The words almost immediately following the passage extracted are as follows: 'But suppose that some '*traditor* had during this time crept into the line of Bishops 'which is drawn from Peter himself to Anastasius who now 'holds the same chair, yet no harm could have been done to the 'Church, and innocent Christians, whom the Lord has cared for 'by saying about bad rulers, "Do what they say, but do not 'what they do, for they say and do not:" that the hope of the 'faithful may be sure, which by being placed not in man but in 'the Lord can never be dissipated by the storm of impious 'schism.'[1] But if he had believed each one of these Bishops to be the peculiar representative of Christ, with whom to be in unity was to be in unity with Christ, he must have conceived that considerable harm would have come to the Church by his being a *traditor*. Look at the different way in which the supporters of the Papacy speak now: 'Christianity rests entirely upon the sovereign pontiff.' 'The sovereign pontiff is the necessary, only, and exclusive foundation of Christianity. To him belong the promises, with him disappears unity, that is, the Church,' is the doctrine of De Maistre. S. Augustine is enumerating in both passages those who succeeded in the local see of Rome as Bishops: there is not a hint of Primacy of any kind. In the last passage *commendavit* is not *committed*, and *episcopatum* is not *pontiff*.

Mr. Wilberforce has brought himself into a difficulty, by trying to grasp at the same time the advantages of two theories, that of development, and that of a direct commission establishing S. Peter and his successors Primates of the Church. A bold theorist might plausibly account for the insignificance of the early Bishops of Rome on the first of these theories, arguing that the Papacy had not yet grown up. Accordingly, Mr. Wilberforce has recourse to this theory (pp. 144—147). But it is irreconcileable with the other theory of a direct commission; for had that commission been really granted, the early Church must have known it, and must have regarded the Bishop of Rome accordingly; whereas, Mr. Wilberforce is driven to the theory of development to account for the fact that they did *not* do so. 'The Church,' he says, 'was as yet like a 'human body in its infant state; it had received its organiza-'tion, in which powers lay dormant which at a later period 'were to awaken into life. As it would be unreasonable, then, 'to doubt that a child possesses the capacity of reason because 'it does not as yet give utterance to its thoughts, so the Church 'may have had a centre of unity, though as yet there was 'nothing to call out its services, and manifest its effect' (p. 144).

[1] S. Aug. Ep. liii. 3.

Digitized by Google

Of course it is open to a controversialist to argue thus: but if he does so, he must give up the theory of a direct commission. The Church could not, like the infant, have been unconscious of its centre of unity, had Christ instituted that centre of unity in Matt. xvi. 16.

We should but be wasting our space were we to follow Mr. Wilberforce in his 'historical evidence' for the existence of this centre of unity in early times. He refers to the twice-told tale of S. Polycarp and Anicetus, of Polycrates and Victor, of S. Cyprian and Stephen, S. Dionysius of Alexandria and his namesake of Rome, Paul of Samosata and the Emperor Aurelian. It is simply wearisome to go over these cases again: they have been shown so often and so incontrovertibly to be not only incapable of supporting Mr. Wilberforce's view of the Primacy, but to be irreconcileable with it. No new light is thrown upon them: they are simply reproduced, one side of them being held up to view, while the other is thrown into the shade. We are told that S. Polycarp came to Rome to discuss the question of Easter with Anicetus. We are not told that the interview exhibits perfect equality of power and honour in the two Bishops. We are told that 'S. Irenæus *entreated* Victor that he *would* not take any harsh step,' &c. Eusebius says that he *gave him advice*, παραινεῖ, and that he was one of those πλητικώτερον καθαπτομένοι τοῦ Βίκτορος, desiring him to be at peace and unity, and in love with his neighbours, while 'he 'was trying (πειρᾶται,) to cut off the Asiatic dioceses from the 'common unity,'—an attempt in which he signally failed.

S. Cyprian's words and acts in the question of Re-baptism, as well as S. Firmilian's, we have already seen.[1] In spite of them, Mr. Wilberforce says, 'It is remarkable that neither 'Dionysius, Cyprian, nor Firmilian, assert that S. Stephen had 'no right to interfere, though, by Firmilian especially, he is 'spoken of with great harshness' (p. 153). If Mr. Wilberforce means, that they did not make use of the words, 'You have no right to interfere,' his assertion is perfectly true, but if he means to say, that they did not deny his right of interference, it is equally untrue. It was his interference that called forth from S. Firmilian the 'harsh' expressions which we have given above; and we have seen S. Cyprian at the head of his council, vindicating the independence of Bishops, with especial regard

[1] The passage in S. Dionysius' letter to Sixtus II., which Mr. Wilberforce translates, 'I wrote to him (Stephen), making intercession for all these men,' is, περὶ τούτων αὐτοῦ πάντων δεόμενος; *i.e.* probably, 'requesting him about all these things.' It is possible that it may mean, 'about all these persons;' but that δεόμενος περὶ should mean 'making intercession for,' is impossible: the 'request' conveyed is, that Stephen would behave with greater moderation and Christian forbearance.—Euseb. vii. 5.

Digitized by Google

to the Bishop of Rome, in 'steady and disdainful repudiation of 'his authority.'[1]

'The presbyters of S. Dionysius of Alexandria having com-'plained of his doctrine to S. Dionysius of Rome,' is no more an indication of the peculiar right of interference which lay in the Pope of Rome (p. 159), than 'the references made 'by Novatian to Alexandria, in his opposition to Cornelius, 'Bishop of Rome' (p. 96,) bear an indication of the peculiar right of interference which lay in the Pope of Alexandria. And it is contrary to historical testimony, to say that Rome alone thus interfered. We have seen that S. Cyprian interfered in Spain, to the extent of cancelling the previous interferences of the Roman Patriarch, *and in Rome itself, for the purpose of preserving the unity of the Church.* Mr. Wilberforce himself tells us (when trying to show the necessity of a Supremacy), that 'in the year 403, Theophilus, Bishop 'of Alexandria, goes to Constantinople with a number of 'Egyptian bishops, holds a synod in a church in the suburbs, 'and deposes S. Chrysostom, the Patriarch of that city' (p. 101), that 'the Oriental bishops complain that S. Athanasius, on 'his way back from his exile at Treves, overthrew the Church's 'order through his whole journey, and restored condemned 'Bishops' (*Ibid.*), that 'S. Chrysostom deposed thirteen Bishops, 'and appointed new ones, where he seems to have had no 'regular jurisdiction' (*Ibid.*). Then it is idle to assert, 'that 'whereas in every other case affairs were settled in the pro-'vince where they arose, there was *one* Church and *one* line of 'Bishops, which interfered or was consulted, respecting every 'matter of internal disagreement which arose during the first 'three centuries' (p. 156). The truth is, that all the great sees had an undefined right of interfering one with the other when occasion called.

With regard to Paul of Samosata, which shows the greatest spiritual power; to depose a Patriarch, which was what the Eastern Bishops did without any communication with Rome; or to be appointed, as the Bishop of Rome was, by a heathen Emperor, as one of a board, consisting of the Bishops of both the districts of Italy, to settle whether the deposed Patriarch should keep a see-house or not?

'Other circumstances might be added,' continues Mr. Wilberforce, "as showing how completely this See formed the middle point of communication to the Church Catholic. The Montanists, from Phrygia, came to Rome to gain the countenance of its Bishop; Praxeas, from Africa, attempted the like, and for a while was successful. Meantime the Churches of Gaul felt especial interest in the Montanist movement in Asia Minor, and therefore

[1] Milman, vol. i. p. 84.

Digitized by Google

"send an embassy to Eleutherus, the then Bishop of Rome, about the peace of the Churches" (Euseb. v. 3). About the same time, Soter, Bishop of Rome, sends alms, according to the custom of his Church, to the Churches throughout the empire, and in the words of Eusebius, "affectionately exhorted them who came to Rome as a father his children." One of the charges made by Hippolytus against Callistus is, that the laxity which had been originally introduced by him, enabled Bishops who had been guilty of deadly sin to escape deposition; and about thirty years afterwards, Basilides, who had been deposed from his Bishopric in Spain, goes to Rome to procure his restoration from S. Stephen.'—P. 159.

Four points are here noticed, on each of which we have a few remarks to make. 1. The Montanists came to Rome. This may be paralleled by Achilli's coming to London; but what does it prove? Having mentioned their presence, Mr. Wilberforce should not have failed to inform us likewise that they made a convert for a time of Pope Eleutherus. 2. Praxeas came to Rome. Yes: and he bewildered Pope Victor, threw Pope Zephyrinus into a sea of theological difficulties, out of which he never emerged, and converted Pope Callistus to a heresy for which he was excommunicated by S. Hippolytus. 3. 'The Churches of Gaul send an embassy to Eleutherus, 'the then Bishop of Rome, about the peace of the Churches '(Euseb. v. 3).' This is a mistranslation and a misstatement. Eusebius's words are, 'There being a difference of opinion on 'this point' (the alleged prophetical powers of the Montanists), 'the brethren in Gaul give their own pious and most orthodox 'judgment about it, and also publish several letters of the 'martyrs who had been perfected amongst them, *which letters 'they' (the martyrs) 'had written while they were still in bonds to 'the brethren in Asia and Phrygia, and also to Eleutherus, the 'then Bishop of Rome, treating* (πρεσβεύοντες) *about the peace of 'the Churches.*' Therefore no embassy was sent at all; it was the martyrs, not the Churches, who wrote: the letters were sent to the Asiatics and Phrygians, as well as to Rome: and, as Valesius has pointed out, the probable reason for writing specially to Eleutherus was, that he had himself become a Montanist, and in Tertullian's words, 'acknowledged the prophecies 'of Montanus, Prisca, and Maximilla, and in consequence of 'that acknowledgment, offered peace to the Churches of Asia 'and Phrygia.'

4. 'Soter sends alms, and affectionately exhorts them who came to Rome, as a father his children.' A liberal and a gentle-hearted Bishop! What then? 5. 'One of the charges 'made by Hippolytus against Callistus is, that the laxity which 'had been originally introduced by him enabled Bishops who 'had been guilty of deadly sin to escape deposition.' And what if he did charge that wicked man with setting an example

Digitized by Google

of iniquity which was likely to destroy good morals and good discipline? What follows? And why should this one 'charge' be selected, while no notice is taken of the other charges which S. Hippolytus brings against him, such as his being an heresiarch? 6. 'Basilides, who had been deposed from his Bishopric 'in Spain, goes to Rome to procure his restoration from S. 'Stephen.' And this is all that Mr. Wilberforce has to say of Basilides! Not one word to inform us that Stephen did attempt his restoration, and that his interference was ignominiously rejected, and the Roman Patriarch's authority superseded by that of the Primate of Africa.

These cases, apposite as we have seen them to be, from Anicetus down to Stephen, are literally all that Mr. Wilberforce has to bring forward in proof of that Primacy which made the Bishop of Rome to be, by Divine commission, the representative of Christ, and the centre of unity to the Church. Let it be steadily kept in mind that *that* is the Primacy which Mr. Wilberforce's argument requires, and not a mere prominence; and it is clear at once that he has nothing to support him. That there is a certain prominence in the Bishops of Rome, is true; and how could it be otherwise, when they were seated in the heart and centre of Christendom, 'the middle point of communication to the world,' upon the rock of the ancient Capitol? Mr. Wilberforce seems to feel that this is a perfectly adequate cause for such preeminence as they enjoyed:—

'It is a more plausible notion that the temporal greatness of the metropolis gradually gave an ascendency to its spiritual ruler; and, that the Bishops of Rome are not the successors of Peter, but the heirs of the Cæsars. Such an idea naturally finds acceptance with them who suppose that the Church is a mere human institution, and that it owes its organization to worldly policy. And this seems to be the real point on which the question turns. If men suppose that the complicated arrangements of the Hierarchy, which rose up during the first three centuries after Christ, were a mere scheme of human contrivance; if they attribute them to the ambition of priests, and the ignorance of the people, or even to the sagacious combination of worldly men, no doubt they will assign the same origin to that central power in which they culminated.'—P. 160.

And again:—

'It is natural that those who suppose, like Hobbes, that the Christian scheme was one of worldly policy, should imagine that the authority of the Bishops of Rome was deduced merely from the influence of their city. Such, however, was not the belief of Christians in early times.'—P. 164.

Are the Second and Fourth Œcumenical Councils 'like Hobbes?' Did they count 'the Church a mere human organization?' Did they 'attribute the arrangements of the hierarchy to the ambition of priests, &c. &c.?' Or, are they the exponents of 'the belief of Christians in early times?' We believe that Mr. Wilberforce will acknowledge them to be the latter, and not

Digitized by Google

the former. But it is these very Second and Fourth Œcumenical Councils which tell us distinctly, and in so many words, that it *was* because Rome was the imperial city that it had its ecclesiastical privileges. The Twenty-eighth Canon of the Council of Chalcedon runs as follows:—

'We, following in all things the decision of the holy fathers, and acknowledging the canon of the one hundred and fifty most religious Bishops which has just been read, [*i.e.* the third canon of the Council of Constantinople,] do also determine and decree the same thing respecting the prerogatives of the most holy city of Constantinople, New Rome. For the fathers properly have granted its prerogatives to the throne of the Elder Rome, because that was the imperial city.[1] And the one hundred and fifty most religious Bishops, being moved with the same intention, gave equal prerogatives to the most holy throne of New Rome, judging with reason, that the city which was honoured with the sovereignty and the senate, and which enjoyed equal prerogatives with the Elder royal Rome, should also be magnified like her in ecclesiastical matters, being the second city after her.'—*Papal Supremacy, &c.* pp. 24, 75.

It *was* then 'the belief of Christians in early times'—it is the recorded testimony of the Church Universal assembled in council—that Rome's position as the seat of empire was the cause of her ecclesiastical preeminence. It is idle, consequently, for Mr. Wilberforce to attempt to browbeat us by telling us that we are 'like Hobbes,' because we hold what the Primitive Church held. He insinuates that men must have reached a very low moral and spiritual state, before they can do that. Rather, he says, 'they will accept S. Cyprian's statement, that the see of Rome 'is "the principal Church," "the root and mother of the Church 'Catholic," *because it is* "the seat of Peter, whence the unity of 'the priesthood had its origin" (p. 164). That S. Cyprian ever did say that the Church of Rome was 'the root and mother of the Church Catholic,' we have already shown to be doubly untrue. But supposing that he had, still would it be of any use to continue to argue with an 'Inquirer' who takes two passages from two different letters of S. Cyprian, two passages which have nothing whatever to do with each other, and unites them with a *because*, so as to make the second the reason of the first, when the very point which he has to prove is, that the thing asserted in the first is the consequence of the second?

We submit that Mr. Wilberforce has not proved that any peculiar commission was transferred from S. Peter to the Bishops of Rome, whereby they became special representatives of Christ, and the head and centre of unity to the early Church; but that the statement that they held any such place, and occupied any such office, is a statement unfounded in history, and against which the voice of history protests.

[1] Translated by Mr. Wilberforce, 'because that city ruled.'—p. 191.

Digitized by Google

III. The next thing is to bridge over the gulf from the Primacy to the Supremacy. The following is Mr. Wilberforce's attempt:—

'Admitting that the successor of S. Peter possessed a Primacy, how does this involve a Supremacy of the Pope? The Pope's Supremacy consists of three principal particulars, which either include or involve the most important rights which have been claimed by his supporters. 1st. The right of finally deciding ecclesiastical causes. 2ndly. The right of presiding over Councils. 3rdly. The right of interfering in ecclesiastical appointments. Are these rights inherent in the Primacy? For if this could be shown, the Supremacy would appear to be only another name for the Primacy, and the proof which has been given of the early existence of the one, would demonstrate the antiquity of the other.'—P. 168.

The test is not sufficient, and the test breaks down. It is not sufficient: for the right of finally deciding causes, of presiding over councils, and of interfering in ecclesiastical causes, might all exist in one person, and yet it need not follow that 'all authority resided' in him, 'and from him was derived to the rest;' which is Bellarmine's account of the constitution of the Church under the Supremacy;[1] nor need it follow that 'the Church was 'a pure monarchy, so much so, that if in an Œcumenical Council 'the greater part of the Fathers agreed with the Pope, all would 'be well, and settled by common consent; but if they disagreed, 'the Fathers' authority would have no force, because in sepa-'rating from their head they cannot represent the Church,' which is the declaration of the Canonists.[2] And, moreover, we might ask by what rule of eclecticism it was, that, whereas the Canon Law orders equally, 'First, that Councils should be called by the Roman pontiff; and, secondly, that he should preside over them;'[3] the former requisite should be omitted, and the latter only retained.

But let us suppose that the test was sufficient. Did the right, then, of finally deciding ecclesiastical causes *inhere in the Primacy? i.e.* had the Bishop of Rome the right of decision in a sense in which no other Patriarch had it, by virtue of his being 'Primate of the Church?'[4] On the contrary, S. Cyprian exercised the right with a higher hand. The only 'references' to the Patriarch of Rome which Mr. Wilberforce is able to enumerate before the time of Julius and the Council of Sardica, are 'the reference 'to S. Stephen against Marcian of Arles, and to S. Dionysius

[1] De Pont. Rom. 4, 24.

[2] Devoti, Inst. Canon. Prol. c. ii. Papal Supremacy, &c. p. 4.

[3] Dev. Prol. 3, § 38.

[4] That it should be as Primate of the Church, and not as Patriarch or Bishop of Rome, that he had this right, is absolutely necessary for Mr. Wilberforce's argument. Anything which grew out of the office which the Bishop of Rome held in common with his brother Patriarchs, cannot arise from the peculiar and direct commission on which he rests the Papal power.

Digitized by Google

'against his namesake at Alexandria' (p. 177); the first is more than paralleled by the reference to S. Cyprian against the same Marcian of Arles, and S. Cyprian's declaration, that it was therefore the business of *himself and* Stephen to remedy that which was complained of;[1] and the latter we can only compare with some discontented letters which sometimes find their way to England, complaining that some Colonial Bishop does or does not hold some doctrine.

Such complaints were made from everywhere to everywhere, when occasion arose. Casaubon, in his masterly explanation of this point, names the following who interfered in matters beyond their immediate jurisdiction for the sake of redressing evils: Eusebius of Samosata, in Syria; Lucifer of Cagliari, at Antioch; Hosius, Gregory Nyssen, Eusebius of Vercelli, Epiphanius of Salamina, in many provinces; S. Cyprian, at Rome, at Arles, in Spain; S. Hilary, at Milan; S. Athanasius, at Antioch; S. Cyril of Alexandria, at Constantinople; and he points out the principle on which these acts took place, viz. that every Bishop was bound to care for the whole Church, and all was done ἀγαπητικῶς.[2]

In the Council of Sardica, which Mr. Wilberforce acknowledges to have 'laid down a *new principle of appeal*,' A.D. 347, 'the appellate jurisdiction of the Pope,' we are told, 'received its first canonical expression' (p. 176). We give the canon in its Greek and its Latin form, as it appears most likely that both were used at the Council.

'Bishop Hosius said: This too we must add, that no Bishop is to go across the borders from his own province to another where there are Bishops, unless he is called in by his brethren, that we may not seem to close the doors of charity. And this too in like manner we must provide, that if in any province one of the Bishops has a matter against his brother and fellow Bishop, neither of the two shall call in Bishops from another province as further judges. If a Bishop thinks that he has been condemned, and suppose that he has a good cause for the judgment to be renewed; *if it seem good to your charity*, let us honour the memory of the Apostle Peter, and let those who have given the decision, write to Julius, the Bishop of Rome, so that the court may be renewed, if proper, by the Bishops who are neighbouring to the province, and let him appoint other judges himself; but if it cannot be proved that his case is such as to require a second trial, let not that which has once been determined be changed, but let the sentence which has been passed stand good.'—*Mansi*, tom. iii. p. 8. *Papal Supremacy*, &c. p. 28.

The first part of the Latin canon is the same as the Greek; we, therefore, give only the latter part where it differs:—

'But if any one of the Bishops has been judged in any cause, and thinks that he has a good case for the council being renewed, *if it please you*, let us

[1] 'Cui rei *nostrum* est consulere et subvenire, frater carissime,' &c. Ep. 67 ad Steph.

[2] See Casaubon's Treatise De Libertate Ecclesiastica, translated and published in Hickes' Treatises, vol. iii. p. 87. Ang. Cath. Lib.

Digitized by Google

honour the memory of S. Peter the Apostle, that those who have tried the cause write to Julius, the Roman Bishop, and if he judges that the trial ought to be renewed, let it be renewed, and let him give judges. But if he determines that the cause is such, that what is done ought not to be retouched, what he has decreed shall be confirmed. Is this the opinion of all? The Synod replied, It is.'—*Mansi*, tom. iii. p. 23.

There is some difference, it will be seen, in these versions; they agree, however, in one clause—'*If it seems good to your charity*'—'*if it please you.*' It does not acknowledge any right whatever inhering in the Bishop of Rome, as Primate, to receive appeals: it makes a concession to the effect that the Bishops, for whom it was legislating (this was a purely Western Council), might by grant of the Council, if the Council willed, be allowed to appeal to Julius, Bishop of Rome, if they thought themselves wronged in a trial; and it grants to Julius, Bishop of Rome, the power of desiring that the cause may be reheard in the province where it arose, if there is sufficient reason. The words—*if it seems good to your charity—if it please you*—are clearly very important words. And they have been dwelt upon at great length by the whole school of Gallican divines, such as De Marca,[1] as well as by Casaubon and our own writers. How, then, does Mr. Wilberforce meet them? What explanation has he to give?—what does he do with them?—*He omits them!* Here is the canon in his version:—

'If a Bishop is judged in any cause, and thinks that he has reason for demanding a new trial, let us honour the memory of S. Peter the Apostle; let them who have examined the cause, write to Julius, the Bishop of Rome, and if he thinks that the trial ought to be repeated, let it be repeated, and let him assign judges.'—P. 176.

This is a simple way of meeting the difficulty; but why stop short with *omissions?*—why not invent a clause as well as leave one out?

With the Sardican decree Mr. Wilberforce is quite satisfied. 'Such was the manner in which the appellate jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome received a legal shape' (p. 177). He does not tell us that the canon is irreconcileable with appeals having been made to Rome by Divine right, or by virtue of the Nicene canons, nor that the canon was reversed in the Œcumenical Council of Chalcedon. The appellate power which, for the West, but never for the East, became vested in the Bishops of Rome, arose, far more, from a decree of the Emperor Gratian in 378: it was increased by a decree of the Emperor Valentinian in 445 (those 'strong-handed associates

[1] 'The words of the canon prove that the institution of this right was new. *If it please you*, says Hosius, Bishop of Corduba, who presided, *let us honour the memory of the Apostle S. Peter.* He says not that the ancient tradition was to be confirmed, as was wont to be done in matters which only require the renewal or explanation of an ancient right.'—De Concord. vii. 3; Papal Supremacy, &c. p. 29.

Digitized by Google

(p. 277) who backed' the Roman Bishops), and it was finally confirmed by the false Decretals of Isidore, which were forged in the middle of the ninth century. Mr. Wilberforce does not quote one of the canons of the Œcumenical Councils on the subject of appeals; and yet there are many. For example, the sixth canon of the Council of Constantinople in 381, adopting the rule laid down by the Council of Antioch in 341, orders that a Bishop, against whom a charge is laid, shall be judged by his coprovincial Bishops, and that from them there should be an appeal to the Bishops of the 'Diocese'—*i. e.* of the country in which the province was situated, but that the appeal is to go no further. And if the Sardican canon 'legalizes the appellate jurisdiction' of the Bishop of Rome, what does the ninth canon of Chalcedon do for the Bishop of Constantinople?

'If a clergyman has a matter against his own or another Bishop, let him be judged by the synod of the province, but if a Bishop or clergyman has a case against the metropolitan of the province, let him take either the Exarch of the "Diocese," or *the* [*episcopal*] *throne of royal Constantinople*, and be judged there.'[1]—*Papal Supremacy, &c.* p. 74.

This canon of the fourth Œcumenical Council, which in matter of appeal appoints the Patriarch of Constantinople as Primate of the Church, is never once mentioned by Mr. Wilberforce. Dupin's account of the authority of the Sardican Council is as follows:—

'Those canons of Sardica have never been received in the East,[2] and only at a late date in the West. As to the East, it is well known that, at the very moment they were being passed, the Eastern Bishops established the very contrary; nor afterwards did they make mention of this right of revising judgments in the Councils of Constantinople, or Chalcedon, or in Trullo, and they there decreed that the decision of the provincial synod, or at farthest of the Patriarch, should be final in all causes. And in the West, after this synod was held, the Africans rejected the discipline sanctioned by it, the French rejected it, nay, even the Italians did not admit its authority.'—*Dupin, Diss. Eccles.* ii. p. 91.

[1] The *Exarch of a Diocese* was the same thing as a Patriarch or Primate. The *Dioceses* at this time were, as is rightly explained in 'Papal Supremacy,' p. 13, 'civil divisions or districts of the Roman empire, made up of several *provinces*.' There were thirteen *Dioceses*—Italy, Egypt, the East (*i.e.* the parts about Antioch), Asia, Pontus, Thrace, Macedonia, Dacia, Illyricum, Africa, Spain, Gaul, Britain, (*Ibid.* p. 76.) The chief Bishop in each *province* was called Metropolitan; the chief Bishop in each *Diocese* or district was called indifferently, Patriarch, Exarch, or Primate. The name Patriarch was, however, by custom confined to the Bishops of the *Dioceses* of Italy, Egypt, and the East, and the Bishops of Constantinople and Jerusalem. The chief Bishop in most of the other Dioceses was called Exarch, and in Africa had the name of Primate. The Bishops of one *Diocese* are strictly forbidden (Council of Constantinople, can. ii.) to intermeddle in the affairs of another *Diocese*. Thus Dioceses, ecclesiastically considered, were independent National Churches.

[2] This is true; for though admitted in the Council in Trullo, they were admitted only in company with other canons enacting the opposite principle of appeal for the East.

Digitized by Google

In spite of this Western synod, and the decrees of Gratian and Valentinian, Mr. Wilberforce acknowledges that the Roman Patriarch's 'appellate jurisdiction' was not 'fully admitted' till the time of Gregory the Great,—that is, for 600 years of the Church's life; nor was it admitted then. How *could* it have been, when it was allowed by the canons of Chalcedon for any Bishop in the Roman district to appeal to the Bishop of Constantinople, but it was not allowed for a Bishop in the Constantinopolitan district to appeal to the Bishop of Rome, or to any other than the Bishop of Constantinople?—when at that moment the Patriarch of Constantinople was attempting to set himself up as head and centre of the Church, putting forth those very claims which the successors of the Roman Patriarchs have since made their own?—when S. Gregory found it necessary to write his famous letters, broadly denouncing the assumption, by him or by any other, of the titles which embody the present Papal idea, because they were destructive of the Patriarchal system of the authority of Bishops, and of the Faith itself (Lib. 5, 43; 9, 68); because they were profane appellations, anticipatory of Antichrist (Lib. 7, 27, 33); because Christ alone is the Head of the Church, and the term Universal (then assumed by John of Constantinople) was an invasion of his rights, and an imitation of the devil? (Lib. 5, 18). Appeal to Rome was not acknowledged in Gregory's time. It was one of the things which grew out of Isidore's forgeries, according to Bishop De Marca's testimony.[1] And Fleury expresses himself on the subject as follows:—

'It is said in the false Decretals, that Bishops cannot be judged definitively save by the Pope alone, and that principle is often repeated there. Nevertheless, you have seen a hundred examples to the contrary; to take one of the most illustrious, Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch, the first See of S. Peter, and the third city of the Roman empire, was judged and deposed by the Bishops of the East and the neighbouring provinces, without the participation of the Pope, whom they contented themselves with informing of it after it was done, as is seen by their synodal letters, and the Pope does not complain of it. Nothing is more frequent in the first nine centuries (*i.e.* until the false Decretals were accepted), than the accusations and depositions of Bishops. But their trial took place in provincial councils, which were the ordinary tribunal for all ecclesiastical causes. One must be absolutely ignorant of the history of the Church, to imagine at any time, or in any country, it has ever been impossible to judge a Bishop without sending to Rome, or obtaining a commission from the Pope. . . . . One of the greatest wounds which the false Decretals have inflicted on the discipline of the Church, is the having infinitely extended appeals to the Pope. It appears that the forger had this point greatly at heart, by the care he has taken to diffuse through all his work the principle, that not only every Bishop, but every priest, and in general every person who finds himself harassed, may, on every occasion, appeal directly to the Pope. He

[1] De Concord. vii. 20.

Digitized by Google

has made as many as nine Popes speak on this subject, Anacletus, the first and second Sixtus, Fabian, Cornelius, Victor, Zephyrinus, Marcellus, and Julius . . . You have seen that all the Greek Bishops, and their Patriarchs even, were judged and often deposed in Councils; that permission was not asked of the Pope to assemble them, nor appeals made to him for their judgments. He was not applied to for the translation of Bishops or the founding of Bishoprics; the canons comprised in the ancient code of the Greek Church were followed. . . . . You will say, perhaps, that it is not surprising that the Greeks did not apply to the Pope, either for appeal or for the other matters, since, from the time of Photius, they ceased to recognise him as head of the Church. But did they apply to him before? And in the time when they were most united with the Roman Church, did they observe anything of that which I call the New Discipline? They were not so heedless as to do it, since the Latins themselves did it not, and this discipline was yet unknown to all the Church.'—*Fleury, Quatrième Discours.*

So much for the first part of Mr. Wilberforce's test. With the second he fares still worse.

'The second main particular in the Papal Supremacy, is the right of presiding in Councils. How comes this to belong to the Bishops of Rome?' —P. 182.

How, indeed? But perhaps we had better first ask, if it is the fact, before we inquire into the manner of accounting for it. Did the Bishops of Rome preside over the Early Œcumenical Councils? As the elder Patriarch of the Church, we should have expected that they would do so. But what says history? Did S. Peter preside at the Council of Jerusalem? No! Mr. Wilberforce maintains that he did (p. 125). Our readers have the Acts of the Apostles before them, and we leave the question to their judgment. Did the Bishop of Rome preside at Nicæa? No! It is almost certain that Hosius, Bishop of Cordova, the Emperor's favourite Bishop, presided. If he did not, he at any rate ranked above the representatives of the Roman Bishops, for he signs above them.[1]

Did the Bishop of Rome preside at Constantinople? No! The second Œcumenical Council, says Mr. Wilberforce, was 'merely an Eastern Synod.' . . . . It was 'presided over therefore by the Bishops of the city where it was held, and the first name subscribed is that of Nectarius of Constantinople' (p. 184). This is not correct. It was presided over by Meletius, Bishop of Antioch, a Patriarch unrecognised by the Patriarch of Rome, and probably at that moment out of communion with him; and it was only upon his death that S. Gregory Nazianzen, and

[1] In the Bishop of Rome being represented by presbyters at Nicæa, Mr. Wilberforce sees something which 'distinguished him from the other prelates:' 'the see of Rome, as being the seat of the Primate, had a privilege of her own, independent of anything belonging to the Episcopal office in general' (p. 185). Unfortunately for this theory, Eusebius and Socrates give us the real reason of the presence of the presbyters. 'The prelate of the royal city was away *on account of his age*, and his presbyters were present, and filled his place.'—Socr. i. 8.

Digitized by Google

Nectarius became successively presidents ('Papal Supremacy.' p. 11). That it should have been 'merely an Eastern Synod,' where Rome was not represented, which fixed the shape of the Nicene Creed, ought, we should imagine, to be some obstacle to the theory of a 'Primacy which involves the Supremacy.'

Did the Bishop of Rome preside at the Council of Ephesus? No! S. Cyril of Alexandria was its president. Thus we see that Jerusalem, Antioch, Constantinople, and Alexandria, that is, all the other four Patriarchates had the honour of presiding at the Œcumenical Councils of the Church before the Patriarch of Rome, on whom that office devolved for the first time at the Council of Chalcedon.

But is it found that the Bishops of Rome presided at the non-Œcumenical Councils—those Councils whose canons were taken into the code of the Eastern Church by the Council in Trullo? Did he preside at Ancyra? at Neocæsarea? at Gangra? at Antioch? at Laodicea? at Sardica? at Carthage? No! not at any one of them. Did he preside at any single Council previous to the Council of Chalcedon, except such as were held in his own Diocese or Patriarchate? No! not at one. And yet, 'the right of presiding at Councils is inherent in the Primacy' (p. 168).

Mr. Wilberforce will not, however, give up the Council of Ephesus. 'The president was the second Patriarch, S. Cyril, 'who acted professedly as the representative of the Primate S. 'Celestine' (p. 184). 'Not only did S. Cyril act as president 'by especial delegation from Pope Celestine, but the Council 'refers to his direction as the ground of its proceeding' (p. 186). The meaning of the last part of this sentence is that 'the Synod wrote to the Emperor, saying, that they had 'deposed Nestorius on finding him guilty of heresy, and that 'they praised Celestine, Bishop of great Rome, who condemned 'Nestorius for his heretical doctrines before our sentence, and 'put out his sentence against him before us for the sake of the 'safety of the Church, and of the holy and saving Faith 'which has been handed down to us from the holy Apostles 'and Evangelists, and the holy Fathers.' To us, as to Bossuet, the reconsideration of a sentence passed by the Roman Patriarch (a similar sentence had been passed by the Alexandrian Patriarch), shows rather a want than an abundance of authority on his part. But it is with the presidency that we have now especially to deal. Mr. Wilberforce has added a very telling note:

'"Vicem nostram Cyrillo delegavimus," &c. Harduin, i. 1318, 1307, 1466.—The commission to S. Cyril himself is given, Harduin, i. 1323, and is referred to by the Egyptian Bishops, 1355, 1475.'—P. 186.

Digitized by Google

Unfortunate, that when we turn to Harduin, we find that 'the commission' referred to has nothing whatever to do with the Council of Ephesus, that the letter containing it was written on the 10th of August, A.D. 430, and that the act which S. Cyril is thereby authorized to perform is to be performed after the expiration of ten days, whereas the Council of Ephesus was not summoned till the 20th of December, that is, more than four months afterwards, and did not sit till the 22d of June, 431. At the time that S. Celestine wrote his letter, the proposal of an Œcumenical Council was not broached. The facts are these. Nestorius and S. Cyril, the two great Patriarchs of the East, being locked in internecine strife, turned for help to the Patriarch of the West. They both wrote to S. Celestine. S. Celestine took the side of S. Cyril and orthodoxy, and followed his lead in the Nestorian controversy just as Julius clung fast to S. Athanasius in the Arian disputes. A Roman Council was held, which resulted in the condemnation of Nestorius by the Roman Church. Upon this Celestine writes to S. Cyril, Aug. 10, 430, the letter which, according to Mr. Wilberforce, appoints him to 'act as president at the Council of Ephesus by especial delegation from Pope Celestine' (at a time when the Council of Ephesus had not yet been heard of), and contains his 'commission' for that purpose. It runs as follows:—

'Join therefore the authority of our See to your own; use our stead; execute this sentence with strictness and vigour: let him either, within ten days from the day of this monition, condemn in writing his wicked teaching, and declare that he holds that faith about the nativity of Christ, our God, which is held both by the Roman Church and by your Holiness' Church, and by the whole of our religion; or if he does not do this, let your Holiness provide at once for his Church, and let him know that he must needs be cut off from our body, since he has been unwilling to receive the treatment of his physicians, and like a pestilent disease, has rushed violently to the destruction of himself and of all entrusted to him. We have written to the same effect to our holy brethren and brother Bishops, John (of Antioch); Rufus (of Thessalonica); Juvenal (of Jerusalem); and Flavian (of Philippi), in order that our sentence, or rather the Divine sentence of Christ, may be known about him. Aug. 10, 430.'—*Harduin*, i. 1323.

S. Cyril, like S. Celestine, held his Council at Alexandria, and then despatched his celebrated letter of excommunication, written not only in his own name, but also by authority of the above 'commission,' in that of S. Celestine. This excommunication was conveyed to Constantinople by four Bishops, and there published Dec. 6, A.D. 430. Nestorius met it with like anathemas against his opponents; and then, to allay the storm, Theodosius called the Council of Ephesus; the sentences of Celestine and Cyril, meantime, remaining without effect, as they awaited the superior authority of a General Council.

So much for the *Vicem nostram Cyrillo delegavimus*, and *the Com-*

Digitized by Google

mission to S. Cyril, which, we repeat, was given for one thing, and is represented by Mr. Wilberforce to have been given for another. But we are told further, that 'it is referred to by the Egyptian Bishops.' The fact indicated by these words is, that the chief notary, who was Peter, an Alexandrian presbyter, read the list of the Bishops who were present at the opening of the Council; and the list begins thus:—'The most religious and pious Bishops, 'Cyril of Alexandria, who was *also* managing the part (διέπον-'τος καὶ τὸν τόπον) of Celestine, the most holy and pious Bishop 'of the Church of the Romans, and Juvenal of Jerusalem, and 'Memnon of Ephesus, and Flavian of Philippi, who was holding 'also the part of Rufus, the most pious Bishop of the Church of 'Thessalonica,' &c. This means that Cyril was armed with the authority of the Patriarch of Rome, as well as his own, and held his proxy just as Flavian held that of Rufus. But where is there anything about his presiding by Celestine's commission, and the Egyptian Bishops acknowledging it? Whether or no he presided simply in his own right, or by his own right, strengthened by the addition of the right of Celestine, is a question which we need not discuss. That he presided in his own right is indubitable, and the reason why S. Celestine's name is recorded is, according to Richerius, that the orthodox body might have a majority of the Patriarchs on their side, whereas without him, they were divided two against two. Most justly Mr. Allies says, that S. Cyril sat as president in his own right; and Bossuet's words are sufficiently explicit: 'Although 'Cyril having been named the executor of the Pope's sentence, 'had executed it in the Council,' (he had executed it previously to the Council;) '*yet he had not been expressly delegated to the 'Council, of which Celestine had yet no thought when he trusted Cyril 'to represent him.* But Arcadius Projectus and Philip being 'expressly sent by Celestine to the Council, confirmed the acts 'of the Council in virtue of this special commission.'[1] After their arrival, which did not occur at the beginning, these three legates are the τοποτήρηται of Celestine and the Western Bishops, and accordingly Arcadius subscribes next after Cyril, who signs first simply in his own character, *i.e.* because he was Patriarch of Alexandria, and President of the Council. The difference between the commission to S. Cyril, previous to the time that the Council was thought of, and of the commission to Arcadius, Projectus, and Philip for the Council, is distinctly stated in the letter of the Synod to the Emperor.[2] And in the letter of the Synod to Celestine, relating the condemnation of S. Cyril and Memnon, by John of Antioch, the especial reason given why Celestine ought to be *personally* indignant at it, is, not that his representative was condemned, but that

[1] Boss. vii. 9. 13.

[2] Hard. i. p. 1483.

Digitized by Google

the Synod had been insulted, in which sat Arcadius, Projectus, and Philip, *τὴν σὴν ἡμῖν παρουσίαν δι' ἑαυτῶν χαριζόμενοι καὶ τῆς ἀποστολικῆς καθέδρας τὸν τόπον ἀναπληροῦντες.*[1]

Richerius, the learned doctor of the Sorbonne, writes clearly and decidedly:—

'Bellarmine, and the other writers of the Roman Court, plead that Cyril presided because Celestine had made him his vicar. But since the Ephesian Council was held against Nestorius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, the right of presiding belonged to Cyril of Alexandria, in the absence of the Roman Pontiff; without any commission from Celestine, he would have held that office in right of his own see, according to the Nicene canons. Why, it is evident from the second action, that Celestine sent Arcadius, Projectus, and Philip to take his place in the Council of Ephesus; the acts declare it in so many words, and yet Cyril signed before them in the sixth Action. *Nor should it be concealed that this letter in which Celestine commits his stead to Cyril, was written before he thought that a General Council was going to be held against Nestorius, and is restricted solely to the execution of his sentence against Nestorius, who he desired should be excommunicated and deposed, unless he repented within ten days after the sentence.* From hence it follows, that it is a vain attempt which is made to prove that Cyril presided over the Council of Ephesus as Celestine's vicar, since that office belonged to him by the prerogative of his own see.'—*Hist. Conc. Gen.* p. 150.

Before leaving the Council of Ephesus, we must give a specimen of how much Mr. Wilberforce can effect by translation, and by a judicious choice of versions: 'We have directed, according to our solicitude, our holy brethren and fellow priests, 'men of one mind with us, and well approved, the Bishops Arcadius and Projectus, and Philip our presbyter, that they may 'be present at those things which are done, and carry out that 'which we have previously appointed; *to which, we have no doubt, 'your Holiness will yield assent, since what is done appears to be 'decreed for the security of the whole Church*'[2] (p. 186). This ought to be translated thus: 'We have sent to you, as undertaking our 'solicitude, the holy brethren our fellow ministers, men proved 'to be of the same soul with ourselves, Bishops Arcadius and 'Projectus, and our presbyter Philip, who will be present at the 'proceedings, and carry out what was long ago settled upon by 'us. *We doubt not that your Holiness will accord with them, for 'whatever conclusion ye shall arrive at would seem to be settled for 'the sake of the security of all the Churches.*'[3] Mr. Wilberforce has

[1] Hard. i. p. 1510.

[2] Hard. i. p. 1741.

[3] *Ἀπεστείλαμεν τὴν ἡμετέραν ἀναδεχομένους φρόντιδα, τοὺς ἁγίους ἀδελφοὺς καὶ συλλειτουργοὺς ἡμῶν, ὁμοψύχους ἡμῖν δεδοκιμασμένους Ἀρκάδιον καὶ Προέκτον ἐπισκόπους, καὶ Φίλιππον τὸν ἡμέτερον πρεσβύτερον, οἳ τοῖς πραττομένοις παρέσονται καὶ τὰ παρ' ἡμῖν πάλαι ὁρισθέντα ἐκβιβάσουσιν· οἷς παρασχεθῆναι παρὰ τῆς ὑμετέρους ἁγιότητος οὐκ ἀμφιβάλλομεν συγκατάθεσιν, ἐπειδὴ τοῦτο ὑπερ ἂν γνῶτε, δοκῇ ὑπὲρ τῆς πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἀμεριμνίας κεκρίσθαι.* There is another reading given in the margin, *ἐπὰν τὸ πρασσόμενον δοξῇ ὑπὲρ τῆς πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησίων ἀσφαλείας*; i.e. since that *which is being done* will have seemed to be decreed for the security of all the Churches; and still another, *ὑπὲρ ἀνέγνωτε, δοκεῖ ὑπὲρ κ.τ.λ.*, i.e. that which ye

Digitized by Google

followed the Latin instead of the Greek text, which was read and approved by the Fathers. There is another version, as follows: 'We have sent Arcadius, &c., who will be present, 'and will confirm afresh with their vote the things which are 'constituted by you. And we doubt not that your Holiness 'will admit them to the common harmony, and the giving of 'the sentence. And whatever ye shall determine, let that, for 'the sake of the tranquillity of all the Churches, be settled and 'defined.' Richerius argues at some length, that this is the genuine reading.[1] The fact of its existence should have been mentioned, and the Greek text ought to have been followed. Nor should it have been concealed that the main work of the Council was done, and the sentence pronounced, before that letter of S. Celestine arrived.

Next, for the Council of Chalcedon:—

'When we come to the Council itself, the four following things appear distinctly: 1st. The Council yields submission to the Pope, in regard to orders which he had previously given to his legates. 2ndly. The Council applies to the Pope to confirm its decisions, and that which is not confirmed by him falls to the ground. 3rdly. It rests the deference paid to the Pope on his claim to represent S. Peter. 4thly. It attributes to the Pope a peculiar personal dignity, so that those who assault him are supposed in an especial manner to assault the Church.'—P. 188.

History asserts the very reverse of all these four propositions. The first is founded on three occurrences: (1.) the deposition of Dioscorus; (2.) the treatment of Leo's letter to Flavian; (3.) the restoration of Theodoret. *These are the very three occurrences which Bossuet brings forward to prove the exact contrary of Mr. Wilberforce's statement, and by which he does prove it triumphantly.* For a full refutation of Mr. Wilberforce we must refer our readers to Bossuet's 'Defence of the Gallican Clergy,' book vii. chap. 15, 17. A translation of his arguments will be found in Mr. Allies' book, 'The Church of England cleared from the Charge of Schism,' p. 279. We cannot be sufficiently amazed that Mr. Wilberforce should have so ventured to peril his good name (if he was kept back by no other motive) as he has done by his reckless statements with regard to the Council of Chalcedon. His account of the deposition of Dioscorus is as follows:—

'At its first meeting, Dioscorus, Patriarch of Alexandria, who had presided at Ephesus two years before, took his place without hesitation as a Bishop. But Paschasinus, the reverend Bishop and vicar of the Apostolic See, said,—"We have the order of the blessed and apostolical Bishop of the city of Rome, the head of all the Churches, in which he has thought meet to order that Dioscorus should not sit in the Synod, but if he attempts to

have read, seems to be decreed, &c. Hard. i. p. 1472. There is evidently something corrupt.

[1] Rich. Hist. Conc. Gen. p. 155.

Digitized by Google

do so should be ejected. To this order we must keep." The reason is given by the other legate: Lucentius, the reverend Bishop who represented the Apostolical See, said, "He must give an account of his own judgment; for he presumed to judge when he had no right, and ventured to hold a Synod without the authority of the Apostolic See, which has never been done, nor ought to be done." Such was the language of the two Bishops who represented the see of Rome in the largest Council which has ever been held, wherein, however, among 520 Bishops, but two Western were present besides themselves. *And Dioscorus, though possessing the third Patriarchal See, was obliged to submit without opposition, and to abandon his place among the Bishops.*'—P. 188.

We must ask our readers to look back again to the passage which we have quoted. They will see there a fact stated, and a lesson drawn from it. The fact is the immediate dismissal of Dioscorus, the lesson the overpowering influence of Rome. Now we will place before them the very words to which Mr. Wilberforce refers for his fact and lesson. The first sentence is correct; we will not therefore repeat it, but merely observe that the 'we' who are 'ordered' means the Legates, not the Council.

'"This order we must keep; if therefore it seems good to your magnificence" (the magistrates) "let him go out or we will go out." The glorious magistrates and most illustrious senators said—"Why, what special charge is brought against the most pious Bishop Dioscorus?" The most pious Bishop Paschasinus, the legate of the Apostolic Throne, said—"It was necessary that he should be objected to on his entrance." The most noble magistrates and most illustrious senators said,—"As we have already said, a special crime of which he is guilty must be exhibited." The pious Bishop Lucentius, who held the place of the Apostolic Chair, said, "Let him give account of the judgment which he passed himself, for he grasped the character of judge when he had not obtained it, and he dared to hold a synod without the authority of the Apostolic Throne, which never has occurred, nor ought to occur." The most pious Bishop Paschasinus, legate of the Apostolic Throne, said, "We (the legates) cannot go against the commands of the most blessed and Apostolic Bishop, who rules the Apostolic Throne, nor against the ecclesiastical canons and the traditions of the Fathers." The most glorious magistrates and most illustrious senators said—"It is fitting that you exhibit what special crime he has been guilty of." The most pious Bishop Lucentius, legate of the Apostolic Throne, said, "It is not endurable that such an insult should be offered to us and to you, as that he should sit here when he is brought forward to be judged." The most noble magistrates and most illustrious senators said—"If you hold the character of a judge, you ought not to plead like an accuser." *And Dioscorus, the most pious Bishop of Alexandria, by the command of the most glorious magistrates and of the sacred senate, remained sitting amongst the others; and the most pious Roman Bishops sat down in their places and kept quiet;* and Eusebius, the most pious Bishop of Dorylæum, came forward and said, "Command my petition to be read, as has seemed good to the most pious Emperor. I am wronged by Dioscorus; the faith is wronged. Bishop Flavian has been murdered. He and I were unjustly condemned by him. Command my petition to be read." The most glorious magistrates and the magnificent senate said, "Let his petition be read." And Eusebius, by the desire of every one, sat down, and Veronician, the sacred secretary of the divine Consistory, took his petition and read it.'—*Hardouin*, ii. 67.

Digitized by Google

Thus, the statement that 'Dioscorus was obliged to submit without opposition, and to abandon his place among the Bishops,' is wholly untrue; and instead of any deference being paid to the Archbishop of Rome, his demand is coolly and contemptuously put aside, and his representatives have to sit down and hold their tongues, after they had threatened to leave the Council if their request was not complied with. The same contemptuous disregard is shown impartially towards the Roman legates when they demand the dismissal of Dioscorus, and towards the Egyptian Bishops when they demand the dismissal of Theodoret. In both cases the magistrates overrule the objectors' petition. So far from true is it, that Dioscorus had 'to submit without opposition, and abandon his place,' that he sat throughout the whole of the Action, the account of which occupies from p. 67 to p. 274 in Harduin's closely-printed folio edition of the Councils: he took an active part in the debates: the acts of the Latrocinium and Flavian's Constantinopolitan Council were read: he was accused, and he defended himself. And at length the magistrates passed sentence on him thus:

'"Since it has been shown, by our inquiry into what was done and determined, and by the confession of the leaders of the late Synod (the Latrocinium), who acknowledge themselves to have been in error, and to have deprived those who all the time were orthodox, that Flavian of pious memory, and the most pious Bishop Eusebius, have been unjustly deposed, it seems to us, according to God's good pleasure, that it is just (if so it seem well to our most divine and pious Lord) that Dioscorus, the most religious Bishop of Alexandria, Juvenal, &c., who held authority, and were leaders in that Synod, should fall under the same punishment that they then inflicted, and should be deprived of their Episcopal dignity, by the sacred Synod, according to the canons, care being taken that everything which occurs is made known to our divine head (the Emperor)." The Easterns and the most pious Bishops with them said, "That is a just judgment!" The Illyrians and the most pious Bishops with them said, "We have all made a mistake! Let us all obtain pardon!" The Easterns and the most pious Bishops with them said, "Long life to the senate! God holy, holy and strong, holy and immortal, have mercy upon us! Long life to the Emperor! The impious man is ever put to flight! Christ has put down Dioscorus! God has put down the murderer! This is a just sentence! this is a just Synod! the senate is just! God hath avenged his martyrs!"'—*Harduin*, ii. 271

It was after *this* sentence, and not till after this sentence, that Dioscorus 'abandoned his place among the Bishops.'

The second Action was occupied with the discussion of the Faith. At the third the magistrates were not present, and the attention of the Council was again called to Dioscorus. Other enormities were charged against him. He was thrice summoned, and refused to appear; and then, one after the other, the Bishops declared their sentence against him. The Pope's legates *of course* spoke, or 'pronounced sentence' (p. 129), first, because they were presiding; then all the other Bishops; and afterwards

Digitized by Google

they severally subscribed. Mr. Wilberforce quotes the latter part of the legates' sentence, but he omits the concluding words. They are as follows:—'Therefore this most holy and great 'Synod will pronounce sentence upon the afore-mentioned 'Dioscorus, in accordance with the canons.' And immediately Anatolius rises and says, 'I am in all things of the same mind 'with the Apostolic Throne, and I give my vote too for the 'deposition of Dioscorus, who has shown himself incapable of 'all priestly ministry, *because he has disobeyed the canons of the 'holy Fathers in everything, and has refused to obey when thrice 'canonically summoned.*' Each of the other Bishops gives his reasons for his vote; and it is remarkable, that *not one* of these expresses any deference towards Pope Leo of Rome, without in the same breath expressing *the same* deference to Pope Anatolius of Constantinople. That the sentence was 'founded' in any special manner 'on the celebrated letter which Leo had addressed to Flavianus' (p. 189), is again wholly untrue. That letter has not in it, and *could not* have in it, a single word directly referring to Dioscorus, or the causes of his deposition. It was written before the Latrocinium was held, and was to have been read at the Latrocinium; and it contained an exposition of the Faith against Eutychianism, which was not laid to the charge of Dioscorus at Chalcedon. We believe that every sentence in this and the following pages of Mr. Wilberforce's book contains a misstatement. We have not space to point them all out. For ample and incontrovertible proof that this celebrated letter was submitted to the judgment of the Council, as superior in authority to the writer, and that it was approved only because it was found on examination to be in accordance with the Councils of Nicæa, Constantinople, and Ephesus, we must refer our readers to the above-named works of Bossuet and Mr. Allies, and to 'Papal Supremacy,' &c. p. 21, or better still, to Harduin, ii. 386.

Again, that 'Dioscorus was sentenced on the very ground 'that, with the aid of the Council over which he presided, he 'had ventured to pass judgment on the Pope' (p. 189), is in several ways incorrect. It was not Leo, but Flavian of Constantinople, and Eusebius of Dorylæum, on whom Dioscorus passed judgment at the Latrocinium. And this, as we have seen, was the reason which the magistrates gave for his own deposition. Other aggravating causes are added afterwards by the Roman legates and by the Synod, in a letter to the Emperors and to Leo, and amongst them, and placed upon the same level with his disobedience to the summons of the Council, is an attempt at excommunicating Leo; but this cannot be what Mr. Wilberforce refers to, as he did not do this 'by aid of the

Digitized by Google

Council over which he presided' at Ephesus, which is clearly the Council referred to, nor by the aid of any Council at all. Baronius, it is true, says that he excommunicated Leo in Alexandria, at a Council of ten Bishops, (a magnificent body 'to preside over,') in the year 449; but Pagi has shown this to be a mistake. It was in the year 451 that he issued the excommunication, holding no Council about it at all, but getting ten Bishops, friendly to himself, to sign the sentence; and the place at which he issued it was Nicæa, where the General Council was originally gathered, before it was transferred to Chalcedon.[1]

The case of Theodoret again teaches the very contrary lesson to that for which it is advanced. Although received to communion by Leo, he was brought forward in the Council, and required to anathematize Nestorius. On his hesitating to do so, he was denounced as a heretic: on his doing it, and not till then, he was restored to his Church by the decree of the Council.[2] 'So, then,' says Bossuet, 'the judgment put forth 'by Leo concerning his restoration to his see, would have profited Theodoret nothing, unless after the matter had been 'brought before the Council, he had both approved his faith 'to the Council, and the judgment of Leo had been confirmed 'by the same Council.[3] If 'the power of acting in the interim, 'on which the ordinary government of the Church depends, is 'shown to be left to the Bishop of Rome' (p. 189), by his having been the first to acknowledge the orthodoxy of Theodoret, how much greater power is shown to be vested in the Bishop of Alexandria, by the measures by which S. Athanasius restored peace to Christendom after the Arian troubles?

The statement, then, that the Council of Chalcedon yields submission to the Pope, in regard to orders which he had previously given to his legates, in the case of Dioscorus, in respect to Leo's letter, or in the case of Theodoret, is not true.

'2dly. The Council applies to the Pope to confirm its decision, and *that which is not confirmed by him falls to the ground.*' Not only is this not founded in fact, but it is contrary to fact. The famous 28th Canon, granting to Constantinople coequal and coordinate rights and dignities with Rome, was passed, and 'failed to obtain Leo's confirmation,' but it did *not* 'fall to the ground.' On the contrary, ever since that time, Constantinople has ranked above Alexandria and Antioch, and next to Rome. The canon was again renewed in the Council in Trullo, as follows:—Canon xxxvi. 'Renewing the decrees of the hundred 'and fifty holy Fathers assembled in this heaven-protected royal

[1] Baronius ad an. 449, vol. viii. p. 47. Pagi ad an. 449, No. 23. Mansi, p. 510.
[2] Hard. ii. p. 499. [3] Boss. Def. Cler. Gall. vii. 13.

Digitized by Google

'city, and those of the six hundred and thirty Fathers assem-
'bled at Chalcedon, we decree that the See of Constantinople
'shall enjoy equal prerogatives with the See of Elder Rome,
'and be magnified, as that is, in ecclesiastical matters, being
'second after it; next to which, let the See of the great city
'of Alexandria rank, then that of Antioch, and then that of
'Jerusalem.' Mr. Allies' comment on this canon is noticeable. He says:—

'Here the famous 28th canon of Chalcedon is referred to as part of the decrees of that Council. By which, as well as by the whole of the intervening history, *we may see the utter untruthfulness of the assertion, that it was given up through the opposition of S. Leo.* And of course the utter incompatibility of this canon with the present Papal Idea is plain at once. It sets clearly before the eyes the enormous and world-wide difference between Primacy and Supremacy. It comes to us on the sanction of two Œcumenical Councils, and a third intended to be so, and which, though not so, has remained the living rule of one half of the Church for 1150 years. But further, we have S. Leo's own authority for saying, that the Roman Church in his day knew nothing of the canons of the second Œcumenical Council; so that from 381 to 451, the whole East was governed by canons never even carried to the Pope; and though S. Leo absolutely refused to receive, and did all he could to annul the 28th canon of Chalcedon, yet his legates at that very Council found Anatolius in full possession of the second place among the Patriarchs, did not attempt to disturb him in it, nay, made it a charge against Dioscorus, that he had pushed Flavian of Constantinople down to the fifth place. In fact, from the Council of 381, the Patriarch of Constantinople is found acting as second Bishop of the Church; he was so at Chalcedon in 451, he was so at Constantinople in 553, and again in 681, and he was so *in spite* of all the Pope could do against him.'—P. 391.

'Leo withheld his approval on the one hand, and on the other the canon prevailed throughout the East; and the See of Constantinople has ever since been accepted there as the first See of the East.'—*Papal Supremacy, &c.* p. 25.

'3dly. It rests the deference paid to the Pope on his claim 'to represent S. Peter.'

To prove the contrary of this statement, we have but to quote a part of this same 28th canon. 'The Fathers have, as was 'just and natural (εἰκότως), given its privileges to the throne of Elder Rome, because'—the Pope represents S. Peter? No! but because, 'that is the imperial city, and moved by the same 'purpose the 150 religious Bishops gave equal prerogatives to 'the most holy throne of New Rome, rightly judging that the 'city which is honoured with the Emperor and the Senate 'ought to enjoy equal prerogatives with the Elder royal Rome, 'and to be magnified in ecclesiastical matters as she is, being 'second after her.' That by these prerogatives are not meant the real prerogatives of Rome, but only 'the accidents of dignity' attached to them' (p. 191), is one of those 'clever but wholly arbitrary distinctions' which rest upon no foundation whatever, but which Bossuet terms 'inventions.'

'4thly. It attributes to the Pope a peculiar personal dignity, so

Digitized by Google

'that those who assault him are supposed in an especial manner 'to assault the Church.' 'When summing up the crimes of 'Dioscorus it is his attack upon the Bishop of Rome, *as being 'fatal to the order and oneness of the Church,* which *forms the 'climax* of their charge. And that not only in their letter to 'Leo himself, but also to the Emperors' (p. 192). The crimes of Dioscorus, which led to his deposition, are given (1) by the magistrates, (2) by the legates, (3) by Anatolius of Constantinople, (4) by the rest of the Bishops, (5) in the letter addressed to Dioscorus by the Synod, (6) in the letter addressed to the Alexandrian clergy, (7) in the letter addressed to the Emperors, (8) in the letter addressed to Leo. (1) The magistrates give only one reason; they say that it is because he deposed Flavian of Constantinople, and Eusebius of Dorylæum in the Latrocinium (Hard. ii. 271). (2) The legates give as the reasons, (α) that he had acted contrary to the canons and ecclesiastical discipline; (β) that he had re-admitted Eutyches to communion; (γ) that he had not allowed Leo's letter to be read at the Latrocinium. 'But he has 'overshot his former wickedness by fresh crimes;' viz. (δ) 'he 'has dared to dictate an excommunication against Leo the 'Archbishop of great Rome; (ε) many charges of iniquity have 'been brought before the holy Synod against him; (ζ) thrice 'summoned he has disobeyed; (η) he has received to com-'munion men lawfully and synodically deposed' (Hard. ii. 345). (3) Anatolius gives as the reasons, (α) that he had been disobedient to the canons of the Fathers; (β) that he had disobeyed the threefold summons (Hard. ii. 345). Elsewhere he gives the reasons as, (α) the excommunication of Leo; (β) the disobedience to the summons (Hard. ii. 450). (4) The causes commonly given by the Bishops are, (α) that he has broken the canons, (β) that he has disobeyed the Council's summons; if they say anything about his conduct to Leo, they place his conduct to Anatolius on the same footing. Thus Patricius of Tyana finds him guilty of 'despising both the divine canons, 'and also the most holy Fathers and Archbishops, Leo of Old 'Rome, and Anatolius of New Rome, and all the holy and 'Œcumenical Council' (Hard. ii. 350). (5) The letter to Dioscorus himself gives as the reasons, (α) 'because thou hast 'despised the divine canons, and (β) hast been disobedient to 'this holy and Œcumenical Council, in that, in addition to 'your other crimes, in which thou hast been found out, thou 'hast been thrice summoned by this holy and great Council ac-'cording to the divine canons, to answer to the charges laid 'against thee, and hast not come' (Hard. ii. 378). (6) The letter to the Alexandrian clergy gives the same two reasons.

Digitized by Google

(7) The letter to the Emperors gives as the reasons, (*a*) that he had refused to allow Leo's letter to be read at the Latrocinium, (*β*) that he had readmitted Eutyches and others. 'And 'perhaps he might have obtained forgiveness for such and 'so great crimes, *if he would have asked for medicine from the* 'Œcumenical Council by worthy repentance; but since over and 'above his other wickednesses (*γ*) he has barked against the 'Apostolical See itself, and has endeavoured to issue letters of 'excommunication against the most holy and blessed Pope Leo, '*he has arrogantly persisted in his former iniquities;* and (*ε*) being 'insolent towards this holy Œcumenical and great Council, he 'has in utter contempt refused to answer to the different accu-'sations against him; and though three times summoned accord-'ing to the divine canons, has not deigned to appear.' (8) The letter to Leo himself gives as the reasons, (*a*) that he had deposed Flavian and Eusebius; (*β*) that he had readmitted Eutyches; 'and falling like a wild beast upon the Vine, he has torn 'up the best plant that he found there, and brought in that 'which had been thrown out as fruitless . . . . and in addi-'tion to all this, (*γ*) he extended his madness against even 'the person who had been entrusted by the Saviour with 'the guardianship of the Vine—we mean your Holiness,—and 'he practised excommunication against the man who had 'exerted himself to unite the body of the Church; and when 'he ought to repent of these things, and to ask with tears for 'mercy, he has rejoiced in them as excellent deeds, (*δ*) reject-'ing your Holiness's letter and setting himself against all the 'doctrines of the truth;' (*ε*) 'and he refused to obey three 'summonses addressed to him.'

Thus the causes of Dioscorus' deposition are various, and his excommunication of Leo is never spoken of alone, as 'forming a climax,' but always together with his refusal to obey the summons of the Council, which Mr. Wilberforce does not mention at all; and when these two last are put together as specially aggravating his guilt, we are also told how they did so; viz., by showing that he was still obstinate, and refused to recant his errors. As to the magnificent titles with which Leo is addressed by the Council, we must recollect that this was an age of magnificent titles; that the Emperor is frequently called, Θεία κορυφή, Divine Head, by the presiding magistrates in the course of the Council; and that in this letter the Constantinopolitans were but making up with Eastern wordiness for the bitter potion of the 9th and 28th canons, which they forced against his will upon the Western Patriarch. They could spare a few compliments when they had enacted by canon the equality of the Pope of Constantinople with the Pope

Digitized by Google

of Rome in ecclesiastical honour and privileges, and the superiority of the former to the latter in the substantial right of receiving appeals. But that they considered the Roman Bishop as the guardian of the Vine in any other sense but that in which they held themselves to be the same, is opposed to their every word and every act. To quote one out of innumerable passages, the Eastern prelates in the Fifth General Council when consciously regarding themselves as distinct from, and opposed to, the Roman prelate, express themselves as follows:—'We, therefore, to whom is committed the charge 'of ruling the Church of the Lord, fearing the malediction 'which hangs over those who do the work of the Lord negli-'gently, hasten to preserve the good seed of faith pure from 'the tares of impiety.' And individuals are spoken of in just the same manner. For example, S. Basil speaks of S. Athanasius as κορυφὴ τῶν ὅλων, 'the head of the whole;' and says, in writing to the same Father, 'There lies upon you as great a care and solicitude for all the Churches as for that which was peculiarly committed to your charge by our common Lord.' And again, 'Our Lord has constituted thee the physician of the infirmities of the Churches,' and S. Gregory Nazianzen says likewise of S. Athanasius, 'that he was entrusted with the mastership (ἐπιστασίαν) of the whole world.' In like manner, Lupus, *Bishop of Troyes*, is thus addressed by Sidonius Apollinaris:—'Thou, a father of fathers, and Bishop 'of Bishops, and another S. James of thy age, dost, as from 'a certain watch-tower of charity, and not from the lower 'Jerusalem, oversee all the members of the Church of our God; 'worthy to comfort all the infirm, and to be deservedly con-'sulted of all.'[1]

However, it *is* true that the Bishop of Rome presided at Chalcedon, and so Mr. Wilberforce says, 'It seems needless to 'go further in Church history in proof that the Bishop of Rome 'was supposed *to possess the power of presiding in Councils;* for 'what can be more conclusive than that which has been adduced 'from the Council of Chalcedon?' (p. 193). Most true, that it is shown that the Bishop of Rome 'possessed the right of presiding in Councils,' *equally with the other great Bishops of the Church;* most false, that it is shown that he possessed any *exclusive* right, or any right *as Primate* in the sense in which Mr. Wilberforce requires us to understand Primate. The Council of Jerusalem equally proves that the Bishop of Jerusalem 'was supposed to possess the power of presiding in Councils;' the

[1] S. Basil, Ep. 69, ad Athan. Op. tom. iii. p. 161, 162. Ep. 82, p. 175. S. Greg. Naz. Orat. 21, § 7. Op. tom. i. p. 389. Sid. Ap. lib. vi. Ep. 1. ad Lup. Bib. Patr. Galland. tom. x. p. 513. See Casaubon's Treatise; Hickes, vol. iii. p. 190.

Digitized by Google

Council of Nicæa, that the Bishop of Cordova was supposed to possess the same power; the Council of Constantinople, that the Bishops of Antioch and Constantinople were supposed to possess the same power; and the two Councils of Ephesus, that the Bishop of Alexandria was supposed to possess the same power. 'What *can* be more conclusive'?

But though it is thus 'needless to go further in Church history,' 'yet one more Council shall be cited, as having been a sort 'of sequel and appendage to the Council of Chalcedon, viz. the 'Sixth General Council, which met to complete the work of its 'precursor by censuring the heresy of the Monothelites, which 'had grown out of that of Eutyches. It was held at Constan-'tinople, A.D. 680' (p. 193). The Council of Chalcedon was, as every one knows, the *fourth* Œcumenical Council. Then why does Mr. Wilberforce leave out the *fifth*, and go on to the *sixth?* The reason is very simple. It is that *at the fifth, the Pope of Rome did not preside. He was present neither in person, (although he was in the very city where it was being held,) nor by his legates, and he was by implication, but designedly, anathematized by the Council as a supporter of heresy.* Now, what kind of dealing with an historical question is this? Mr. Wilberforce has a theory about Councils. To bend the facts connected with the earliest Councils is a sufficiently hard work, but he does at least attempt it. Presently he reaches the fifth General Council. This lies right athwart the very course of his argument, and no ingenuity can make it fit with his hypothesis. How does he proceed? Does he deny the facts? No! that is impossible. Does he, then, give up his theory? No! Does he even acknowledge the difficulty? No! What else remains? A very simple expedient — he omits all notice of the fifth Council, and *skips* from the fourth to the sixth. This may be ingenious, but it is not, after all, so convincing as straightforwardness, and it is unworthy of one who professes to be examining and inquiring before the solemn tribunal of God, and in the sincerity of his own soul.

And when Mr. Wilberforce has thus reached the sixth Council, how does he deal with it? He professes to exhibit from it 'the relation of the ancient Universal Councils to the successor of S. Peter' (p. 194). With such a profession as this in his mouth, is it fair, is it right, is it conceivable, that he should have concealed the fact that Pope Honorius was anathematized by name in this Council; and that the Council itself was not presided over by Pope Agatho's legates, who were present, but by the Emperor Constantine; and that he should have quoted as the genuine exponent of the mind of the Council a corrupted passage which does not appear in the Greek text,

Digitized by Google

which was alone read to the Council? The lesson that Bossuet learns is something very different. He writes—

'As the third, fourth, and fifth Councils passed judgment on the decisions of Roman Pontiffs, and only approved of them after inquiry, so the sixth Council is known to have done; and that course is common to all Councils. . . . . They inquire into the decrees of the Roman Pontiffs, and after inquiry made, approve Agatho's decrees, condemn those of Honorius. . . . . This we find to be certain. Honorius duly questioned by three patriarchs *de fide*, gave the worst answer possible; was condemned with anathema by the sixth Council; was excused by Roman Pontiffs before the supreme sentence of the Council, and after that sentence was condemned with the same anathema.'[1]—*Def. Cler. Gall.* vii. 21, 26.

Certainly if Mr. Wilberforce has represented history fairly, Bossuet has disgracefully misstated it. For example, Mr. Wilberforce's last remarks on the subject of Councils is as follows, and it is put forth as though no one had ever denied or doubted it:—'The Council of Chalcedon rests its deference 'to Leo on the same grounds which were stated by S. Peter 'Chrysologus, just before it assembled, "Blessed Peter, who 'lives and presides in his own see, supplies truth of faith to 'those who seek it"' (p. 195). Bossuet has written many pages demonstrating the contrary of this assertion, and there are few statements which admit of so ample and satisfactory a refutation, for all the Bishops, one after the other, give their reasons for accepting Leo's letter. Not one rests it upon the simple authority of the see of Rome. Almost every one says that he accepts it because it agrees with other received documents and professions of faith. Indeed, Leo's orthodoxy is tested by his agreement with Cyril: Alexandria is made the standard by which to try Rome.

All, then, that Mr. Wilberforce has proved about the Councils is this, that the Bishop of Rome presided at one, and only one, out of the six first General Councils, viz. at the Council of Chalcedon. *If*, then, 'the right of presiding at Councils inheres in the Primacy,' it is clear that the Bishop of Rome could not have held the Primacy, and that there could have been no such Primacy in the Church.

The third test by which the Supremacy is to be identified with the Primacy is, 'the right of interference in all ecclesias-

[1] The sentence on Honorius is as follows:—'Besides this, we order that Honorius, who was Pope of ancient Rome, be cast out of the holy Church of God and anathematized, because we find, by his writings to Sergius, that he has in all things followed his mind, and confirmed his impious dogmas.'—Hard. iii. 1599. Pope Leo II. writes—'We anathematize also Honorius, who did not illumine this apostolical Church with the doctrine of apostolical tradition, but by a foul betrayal attempted to subvert its spotless faith.'—Hard. iii. 1475. The seventh Council also refers to the excommunication, and Honorius' name is found among the anathematized in the Liber Diurnus Romanorum Pontificum.—Routh's Opusc. ii. 153.

Digitized by Google

'tical appointments.' 'This was, no doubt, the last of the three 'to receive legal form and expression' (p. 195). 'But it was 'not till long afterwards that the system of referring to the see 'of S. Peter received that settled form which gave stability to 'the mediæval Church: and the great agent through which 'this work was effected was not a Roman Bishop, but our 'countryman, S. Boniface the Apostle of Germany' (p. 199). 'It 'was through the example and influence of this first of English 'missionaries, and through the glory of his martyrdom, that 'the system prevailed for which he offered up his life' (201). So the two offices of the Primacy and of the Supremacy are to be identified by their both exercising a function, which function was confessedly not exercised till the eight century after Christ. This seems to us childish. Meantime, Mr. Wilberforce has not given us one of the innumerable testimonies of Councils Œcumenical and Provincial, of Bishops, of Doctors, of Martyrs, and of Fathers, that interference in one branch, or 'Diocese,' of the Church by any one Bishop not belonging to that 'Diocese,' was forbidden throughout the early ages by the whole authority of the Church Catholic, unless such interferences took place simply ἀγαπητικῶς, and then it belonged to all Bishops, one as much as another. If we were to quote all the passages on this subject in the writings of the Doctors of the Church, we should fill an octavo volume: simply to transcribe the canons of the Councils which were passed for the purpose of maintaining the independence of the Churches of the several 'Dioceses,' would fill many pages. We must refer our readers to the Council of Nicæa, canons v. vi.; to the Council of Constantinople, canons ii. iii. vi.; to the Council of Ephesus, canons i. viii.; to the Council of Chalcedon, canons ix. xvii. xxviii. xxx. Almost all of these canons are given in the Greek, Latin, and English, in 'Papal Supremacy,' &c., p. 69. We have here only room for part of the eighth Ephesine canon:—

'This same rule shall be kept also in the other "Dioceses" and the provinces throughout the world, that no one of the religious Bishops shall lay his hand upon another province which has not been under his, that is, his predecessor's control, originally and from the beginning; and if he has laid his hand upon it and forcibly reduced it under himself, he is to restore it; that the canons of the fathers be not transgressed, and the pride of worldly power be secretly introduced under the cover of the priestly function, and by little and little, without marking the steps by which it is lost, we be deprived of the liberty which our Lord Jesus Christ, the deliverer of all men, has given us by His own blood.'—P. 73.

We must add part of the second Constantinopolitan canon:—

'Bishops who are outside a "Diocese," are not to invade the Churches which are across the borders, nor to bring confusion into the Churches; but according to the canons, the Bishop of Alexandria must have *the sole* ad-

Digitized by Google

ministration of the affairs of Egypt, and the Bishops of the East must administer the East only (the privileges which are assigned to the Church of Antioch by the canons made at Nicœa being preserved), and the Bishop of the Asian Diocese must administer the affairs of the Asian only, and those of the Pontic Diocese, the affairs of the Pontic only, and those of Thrace, the affairs of Thrace only. Moreover, Bishops are not without invitation to go beyond the bounds of their Diocese for the purpose of ordaining, *or any other ecclesiastical function*.'—P. 12.

If once the force of these two canons is appreciated, we may see in them, as in a mirror, the whole constitution of the Church at the time of the Council of Constantinople. We must again remind our readers that in reading of a 'Diocese,' they must put out of their thoughts what is now called by that name but was then denominated a Parish, and they must recollect that something is meant very little, if at all different, from a National Church. That which was presided over by a Bishop was called παροικία, or Parish; that which was presided over by a Metropolitan was called an ἐπαρχία, or Province, and consisted of many παροικίαι; that which was presided over by a Patriarch, Exarch, or Primate (according as he had one or other of these three names) was called a Diocese. Now, this word Diocese is not originally an ecclesiastical term: it is the name of a civil division of the Empire, constituted by several provinces, and ruled by a præfect. There was then established in each of these Dioceses a Church containing a hierarchy, in which we may mark three steps,—the lowest, the Bishops, whose jurisdiction was confined to their παροικίαι; the next, the Metropolitans (two, three, or more in number, according as the Diocese was larger or smaller), each of whom had jurisdiction over a province; and, lastly, a Primate, who had jurisdiction over the whole Church of the Diocese. There is nothing more clearly brought out by the ancient canons than that each of these Churches was a distinct and independent whole in itself, bound, it is true, to the other sister Churches by the tie of love and the bond of the Holy Spirit uniting them all to their one Head and to one another, but absolutely free from all authoritative control exercised by any Bishops whatever without the limits of that Church or Diocese. At the time of the second Council the world was divided into thirteen such Dioceses; five of them are referred to in the above-quoted canons,—viz. Egypt, the East (*i. e.* the parts about Antioch), Asia, Pontus, Thrace. The eight others are—Italy, Macedonia, Dacia, Illyria, Africa, Spain, Gaul, Britain. As then there were thirteen Dioceses, the theory of the Church was, that there should be thirteen Diocesan Churches; and this theory was carried out, except so far as it was prevented from taking effect by the inhabitants of some of these Dioceses not having been Christianized. It is of these Dioceses that the canon

Digitized by Google

speaks—'Bishops who are outside a *Diocese* must not invade 'the Churches which are across the borders, nor bring confusion 'into the Churches.'

So far the constitution of the Church is clear enough. It consisted theoretically of thirteen independent, federal, Diocesan Churches. But now there came in two cross principles; the first was, that the Primate of that Diocesan Church which contained the greatest cities should borrow dignity from the greatness of those cities; the second, that respect should be paid to those Churches which were founded by the Apostles. In accordance with the second of these principles, we have seen that Tertullian declares that those Churches ought to be held in special regard which were founded by S. Paul and S. Peter, and thus an undefined reverence gathered around the names of Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, and Rome, which caused certain prerogatives of honour to be attached to the holders of those sees, above the other Primates. This principle, however, had not nearly so much weight and influence as the other that has been mentioned. We have seen that the Councils of Constantinople, Chalcedon, and Constantinople II. give as the reason of the prerogatives assigned to Rome and Constantinople the presence of the imperial power in those cities. And even had they not so expressly declared it, we might have gathered that it must have been so, for otherwise the apostolic sees of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria would never have allowed the unapostolic see of Constantinople to be preferred before themselves without making complaint; and indeed, on any other principle than this, the order of the Diocesan Churches would have been, Jerusalem, Antioch, Rome, Alexandria, rather than Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and on the Roman hypothesis of S. Peter's authority, still less could Alexandria have been placed before Antioch, had it not been that the Bishops ranked according to the greatness of their cities.

By virtue, then, of the first of these cross principles, the Bishops of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem were endued with a dignity which other Primates had not; by virtue of the second, the Patriarchs of Rome and Constantinople were raised above their brother Primates; so much so, that at the Council of Chalcedon a certain authority was given to the Patriarch of Constantinople over three Diocesan Churches, and appeals were allowed to him as much as to the appellant's own Patriarch from all parts of the Church. These were two points in which encroachments were made on the ancient constitution of the Church in favour of Constantinople; but yet it was done legitimately at an Œcumenical Council, and was of course capable of revision at any time. Rome never had any such

Digitized by Google

power, except by assumption and usurpation; all that she could and did appeal to was the Provincial Council of Sardica, (the canons of which Pope after Pope attempted to pass off as those of Nicæa,) and the decrees of the Western Emperors which backed her power. But still the Patriarch of Rome was Primate of a Diocese, Bishop of the imperial city, and possessor of an Apostolical see. There was no other Bishop who could claim all three of these advantages. For Constantinople was not founded by an Apostle, and Alexandria and Antioch were not imperial cities. Rome, therefore, was likely to push her power beyond its bounds, and it would seem that it was often with special regard to her that the Church passed its emphatic laws, forbidding the Bishop of one Diocese to interfere with the Bishops of another Diocese. In later times she did so 'interfere in ecclesiastical appointments,' though these laws remain to this day unrepealed, though she was never exempted from them as the see of Constantinople may seem partially to have been at Chalcedon; and the means by which she gained her right of interference in the West—*for she never had it in the East*—were mainly the false Decretals of Isidore, and the Decretum of Gratian founded upon them.

Were we drawing a picture of the ancient constitution of the Church, it would be necessary to dwell further on the different names of Patriarch, Exarch, and Primate, and on those Churches which had the privilege of *αὐτοκεφαλία, i. e.*, which were governed by Metropolitans alone, and had no Primate; but we have said enough to show how entirely contrary to the spirit of the early Church it was, that the Patriarch of Rome should 'interfere in the ecclesiastical appointments' of any other Diocese except his own, and how entirely contrary to fact it is that he did so.

We conclude, then, that whereas Mr. Wilberforce has arbitrarily fixed a threefold test, in itself insufficient, whereby to identify the Supremacy with the Primacy, the test breaks down in all its three branches; that he has not shown, nor can it be shown, that the right of finally deciding ecclesiastical causes was in the early Church vested in the Bishop of Rome any more than in the other great Bishops of Christendom; that he has not shown, nor can it be shown, that the right of presiding at Councils was vested in the Bishop of Rome any more than in the other great Bishops of Christendom; that he has not shown, nor can it be shown, that the right of interfering in all ecclesiastical appointments was vested in the Bishop of Rome any more than in the other great Bishops of Christendom.

If the case were one which required still further confirmation—if appeal to authority were still needed—such authority might

Digitized by Google

easily be obtained. It is but within a few months that death has taken away from us the wisdom and learning of one who has so long held the position of the Patriarch of ecclesiastical learning in our elder University. The venerable head of the President of Magdalen College, white with the snows of near a hundred years, has been bowed to the grave which has so long spared him to us. For more than eighty years he lived amidst the Fathers of the Church. Chrysostom, Augustine, Basil, Ambrose, were to him as familiar friends, and their writings and maxims as household words. He has left to us his matured judgment on the question of the power of the Roman see in the primitive Church:

'Assuredly,' he writes, 'it is a thing contrary to the decision both of the Eastern and Western Churches in the first ages, that any power over the faith of the other Churches, or immunity from error, should be acknowledged in the Roman Church as granted by God to it. Whatever the rights and privileges of the first see now are, or ever have been, the Eastern Church at least declared that they rested on no other foundation except ancient custom and synodical constitution; nay, the whole world in the Nicene Council ascribes its rights to that see and to the other greater Churches on no other ground except as having arisen from ancient custom. And however much honour the Bishops of the City of Rome have gained to themselves from the greatness of the Apostles Peter and Paul, the founders of the Roman Church, yet it was "because that was the imperial city," as the General Council of Chalcedon has declared, "that the Fathers, as was right and natural, gave them their prerogatives." ... The appeals to the Roman Bishop, which the Sardican Council allowed through partiality to him, and in honour to S. Peter (to the effect that some causes, although previously judged, might be reconsidered in the same province in which they arose, provided that the pontiff so ordered), were far from being sanctioned by the Universal Church. This is clearly proved by the sixth canon of the second General Council, and the ninth canon of the Council of Chalcedon. Nay, we know from a letter of the Roman pontiff, Nicolas I., to Photius, that the Council of Sardica itself was not acknowledged by the Greeks in the ninth century. I say nothing of the false Decretals in which these appeals appear, for they are now known by all to be forged commodities, and to have been foisted in a little before the time of Photius.'—*Scrip. Eccl. Opusc., Præf.* p. vi.

This famous forgery of the Decretal Letters, which had such an enormous influence on the Church, and deceived it for 700 years, Mr. Wilberforce dismisses in half a page, as having been rather detrimental than otherwise to the Papal power. That, on the contrary, this forgery is the main foundation of the Supremacy—the bridge by which the Roman prelates passed from being first Bishops *in* the Church, to being (in the West) Supreme Monarchs *over* the Church—is made clear by Fleury, 'Troisième et Quatrième Discours;' De Marca, 'De Concordiâ,' vii. 20; Van Espen, iii. 478; 'Papal Supremacy,' &c., p. 52. 'That which 'the East and we have rejected,' says Mr. Allies, 'is not 'the Pope's Primacy, as it was understood and practised in

Digitized by Google

'the time of the seven Œcumenical Councils, but the uni-
'versal Bishopric, of which Nicholas I. laid the foundations,
'Gregory VII. reared the structure, and Innocent III. com-
'pleted the building.... Nicholas I. and the succeeding pontiffs
'made use of the False Decretals to build up their spiritual
'monarchy, and the new principles contained in them became the
'basis of Gratian's Decretum, and consequently of the Church's
'discipline in the West' (Pref. p. xiv.).

IV. We have lastly to show, that Mr. Wilberforce has not proved that in the sixteenth century the English Church rejected the divinely constituted head and centre of Christendom, and assumed the King or Queen of England as the head and centre of unity, but that this statement is a false statement.

There is something so extremely preposterous in this proposition, so entirely opposed to what we all know, feel, and understand, that we have scarcely patience to adduce grave arguments against it. There is, however, no appearance of anything but seriousness in Mr. Wilberforce's method of dealing with the subject, and we will, therefore, meet him in the same spirit.

Mr. Wilberforce's theory is stated as follows:—

'The purpose which the Crown's Supremacy was intended to effect, was exactly that which our Lord's promise to S. Peter was designed to secure. The operation of that promise, as we have seen, was to form the college of Apostles into a single body, and then to enable them to act together in the maintenance of truth. This is the precise object assigned to it by the early Fathers; and this is just that which Henry VIII. proposed to imitate by his Supremacy. Its purpose was to unite the clergy of the English Empire into a single "*body spiritual.*" Thus was there a new principle of combination in place of that provided by our Lord.'—P. 232.

'It was the Royal Supremacy by which the English Bishops were first moulded into a body, and thereby were supposed to gain power to decide questions of doctrine.'—P. 233.

'That which qualified it for such functions, was the authority of the Sovereign, which made the Bishops of our two provinces into a body, just as the collective Bishops of Christendom had formerly been combined into the one body of Christ. This was the assertion of the 24th of Henry VIII. 12, and the ground on which the title, Head of the Church, was important. It implied that the Bishops who stood to Henry in the relation of subjects, were combined by that circumstance into a body, or spiritual entity, and had the same power, therefore, to grant mission, or determine doctrine, which had formerly been possessed by the Universal Church.'—P. 228.

'Now is it not clear that the function thus assumed by our Sovereign, is exactly that, which, according to the laws of the ancient Church, belonged to the chief Apostle? Its purpose is to constitute the Bishops into a *whole*, so that they may be able to make final settlement in questions of doctrine.' —P. 237.

'The separation between the Church of England and the rest of Christendom, has been shown to depend upon that spiritual headship which is claimed by our Sovereign, whereby the Bishops of this realm are constituted into a distinct body, and determine all articles of faith, as though they were the whole body of Christ.'—P. 251.

Digitized by Google

'The new head by whom they were combined into an isolated body.'—P. 253.

'The Royal Supremacy consolidated them into a whole, and thus enabled them to speak with authority.'—P. 275.

'This circumstance (the Sovereign's being Head of the Church), as has been seen, is alleged to give the English clergy that unity which forms them into a whole.'—P. 278.

We believe that there are persons who credit an unfounded assertion when it has been made eight times, simply because it has been made eight times. We, therefore, give Mr. Wilberforce the benefit to be derived from his repeated assertions. We have, however, several remarks to make upon them.

1. We beg our readers to remark how what was, in p. 121, a modest hypothetical resting upon one person's authority: '*If* '*Cyprian* has preserved the right interpretation of those events 'which are recorded in the Gospels, our Lord's reason for giving 'this especial commission to his chief Apostle, (a thing, by the way, which Cyprian distinctly denies ever was given,) 'was to 'secure unity among the rest,' (a thing, by the way, which Cyprian never says,)—has grown into a categorical, and apparently universal proposition, in p. 232:—'This is the precise object assigned to it *by the early Fathers*,' and has become converted into a law, in p. 237:—'The function which, *according to the laws of the ancient Church*, belonged to the chief Apostle.'

2. We must also ask them to call to mind that this function of S. Peter, which our Sovereigns are represented as having stolen from the Popes, is a fiction, for which, out of all the tomes of antiquity, no support can be found, except such as may be derived from a misinterpreted text of S. Cyprian, which, when rightly interpreted, means just the contrary; and from two passages taken out of the writings of S. Jerome and Optatus, which *do not* really support it, but which is incidentally, and sometimes formally, denied by all the great Doctors of the East, the West, and the South.

3. But with regard to this function of our Sovereigns itself—how and where did Mr. Wilberforce discover it? What facts does the thing rest on? What documents of the Church attest it? Clearly it must be openly professed, if it is the case. For let us think what it is—no less than that our Sovereigns hold towards the Anglican Church the same office which Mr. Wilberforce has been maintaining that S. Peter and his successors held towards the whole Church; *i.e.* that of being the special representative or Vicar of Christ in things spiritual—the centre of unity whereby they are combined into a spiritual whole. Does any one hold such a belief in England, Scotland, America, or the Colonies? We know no such person. Did any one ever hold

Digitized by Google

it? We never heard of such a person. Has it been put forth in the writings of Anglican Divines? We have never seen it: and yet we have seen many arguments on the subject of the title, 'Supreme Head on earth of the Church of England,' which was adopted by a tyrannical Sovereign many years before the Reformation, borne by his son, and for a time, by his *Roman*-Catholic daughter, and finally repudiated by her and her *Anglo*-Catholic sister. Surely Mr. Wilberforce must have some authority for his statement from the authorized formularies of the Church. Do we then find in the Articles or Canons that the Sovereign is the head and centre of unity which combines the Bishops into a body? Nothing of the kind. All that Mr. Wilberforce appeals to as justifying his assertion, is the 24th Act of Henry VIII. c. 12, which he quotes as follows:—

'They decreed that "this realm of England is an empire, and so hath been accepted in the world," "the body spiritual whereof having power, when any cause of the law divine happened to come in question, or of spiritual learning, then it was declared interpreted, and showed by that part of the said body politic, called the Spirituality, now being usually called the English Church, which always hath been reputed, and also found of that sort, that both for knowledge, integrity, and sufficiency of number, it hath been always thought, and is also at this time, sufficient and meet of itself, without the intermeddling of any exterior person or persons, to declare and determine all such doubts, and to administer all such offices and duties as to their rooms spiritual doth appertain.'—P. 223.

Mr. Wilberforce says, 'that the assertion of' this '24th of 'Henry VIII. c. 12,' is that 'that, which qualified the English 'Church for such functions (as mission) was the authority of the 'Sovereign, which made the Bishops of our two provinces into a 'body, just as the collective Bishops of Christendom had formerly 'been combined into the one body of Christ.' We have been quite unable to find this in the above extract, or in any part of 24th Henry VIII. c. 12. We have already seen, that there were in the early Church as many 'spiritual bodies' as there were Dioceses, and that the Bishops in their Dioceses were 'reputed for knowledge, integrity, and sufficiency of 'numbers, sufficient and meet of themselves, without the 'intermeddling of any exterior person or persons, to declare 'and determine all such doubts, and to administer all such 'offices as to their rooms spiritual did appertain.' So says, in very similar words, the already-quoted second canon of the second Œcumenical Council, provided always (though the provision is not expressed either in the canon or in the law) that there lay a final appeal, in matters of faith, to a Council of the Universal Church, duly elected and congregated. Now, as the characteristic feature of an empire or kingdom is the power of the Sovereign which extends over it, so the characteristic feature

Digitized by Google

of a Diocese was the power of the Præfect which extended over it. Would it, then, be just to say, that 'it was the authority of 'the Præfect which qualified the Diocesan Church for its 'functions, and which made the Bishops of the provinces in the 'Diocese into a body,'—'which combined them into a spiritual 'entity,' &c.? If not, neither is it just to say, that it is the authority of the King of England which makes the Bishops of the provinces of the kingdom into a body, combines them into a spiritual entity, &c.

The Act is, like other documents, misquoted. Mr. Wilberforce represents it as though the then Parliament '*decreed*' that 'England is an empire,' and suggests that the purpose of this decree was to draw an analogy between the empire of Rome and the kingdom of England, with a view to ecclesiastical things. Now, that Act of Parliament does not so 'decree,' and the purpose attributed to its framers in making such a decree is a pure figment resting upon no foundation whatever. The words that Mr. Wilberforce has extracted are not in the Act, but in the preamble to the Act. It begins as follows:—'Whereas by sundry 'old authentic histories and chronicles it is manifestly declared 'and expressed *that this realm of England is an empire*, and so 'hath been accepted in the world, governed by one supreme 'head or king,' &c. The description of the body spiritual, likewise, is not the 'decree' of the Act, but merely the preamble, creating nothing, and simply repeating an acknowledged fact; a fact recognised by the laws of Edward I., Edward III., Richard II., and Henry IV., against Papal intrusion (laws which are referred to in the same preamble), just as much as by this Act. What is really enacted by the Bill is, 1. That causes about wills, marriages, &c. should be settled within the realm. 2. That appeals to any foreign potentate are forbidden. 3. That appeals should lie from the Archdeacon to the Bishop, from the Bishop to the Archbishop, 'there to be definitively and 'finally ordered, decreed, and adjusted according to justice, with-'out any appellation and provocation to any other person or 'persons, court or courts.' 4. That in cases touching the king, appeals might be made—to himself? No. To the *Upper House of Convocation*; and 'whatsoever shall be . . . adjudged by the 'aforesaid prelates, abbots, and priors of the Upper House of the 'said Convocation, as is aforesaid, shall stand and be taken for 'a final decree and sentence . . and never after to come in ques-'tion and debate to be examined in any other court or courts.' This is the Act which, according to Mr. Wilberforce, 'asserts' that it is 'the authority of the Sovereign which qualifies the 'Church of England for its functions, and that it is the royal 'authority which combines the Bishops into a body.' And this

Digitized by Google

Act is the only ground that he has brought forward for his oft-repeated theory.

We presume that any one who was desirous of learning the true position of the English Sovereign towards the Church, would inquire what statements the Church on the one side, and the Crown on the other, have made on the Royal Supremacy. These statements exist, though they are not quoted by Mr. Wilberforce. They are as follows:—

'We give . . . to our Princes . . . that only prerogative which we see to have been given always to all godly princes in Holy Scriptures, by God himself; that is, that they should rule all estates and decrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil doers.'—*Article* 37.

And Queen Elizabeth's explanation of her own authority is quite in accordance with the Church's statement:—

'Her Majesty neither doth nor will challenge any other authority than that was challenged, and lately used by King Henry VIII. and King Edward VI., which is, *and was of ancient time*, due to the imperial crown of this realm; that is, under God, to have the sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons born within these her realms, dominions, and countries, of what estate, either ecclesiastical or temporal, soever they be, so as no other foreign power, shall or ought to have any supremacy over them.'—*Wilkins, Concil.* vol. iv. p. 188.

Again, Mr. Wilberforce's statements with regard to the title, Supreme Head of the Church, are recklessly incorrect. He says:—

'The title of Supreme Head of the Church of England, still belongs to our Sovereigns by Act of Parliament. It was assigned to them by 25 Henry VIII. 21, s. 2, and by 37 Henry VIII. 17, s. 3, which were revived by the 1st of Elizabeth; and it was again bestowed in 2 and 3 Anne, 11.'—P. 229.

Now the truth is, that it was 26 Henry VIII. c. 1, which assigned the title to our Sovereigns. This was confirmed by 35 Henry VIII. c. 3, and it was declared to be high treason to deny it, by Edward VI. c. 12. All three of these Acts were repealed by 1 and 2 Philip and Mary, c. 8; and their repeal was *not reversed but confirmed* by 1 Elizabeth, c. i. 50, that they should 'stand, remain, and be repealed and void, in such 'like manner and form as they were before the making of this 'Act, anything herein contained to the contrary notwith-'standing!' Those Acts of Henry's which Mr. Wilberforce quotes, were *not* passed for the purpose of assigning this title to the Sovereign, but the first of them for repressing the pecuniary exactions of Rome, and the second for permitting the marriage of Doctors of Civil Law, and they only incidentally and parenthetically refer to the Supremacy at all. But Mr. Wilberforce says that the title of Supreme Head was again

Digitized by Google

bestowed on our Sovereigns by 2 and 3 Anne, c. 11. Now who is there who would not suppose from these words, that 2 and 3 Anne, c. 11, was a Bill similar in nature to 26 Henry VIII. c. 1, or 35 Henry VIII. c. 3, enacting that the title, Supreme Head of the Church of England, should belong to the English Sovereigns? This is so far from being the case, that it is the Act which was passed for constituting Queen Anne's Bounty: and there is nothing in it from beginning to end about the title of the Sovereign, except that in the preamble there is the following parenthesis: 'Forasmuch as your Majesty taking into 'your princely and serious consideration the mean and insuf- 'ficient maintenance belonging to the clergy in divers parts of 'this your kingdom, has been most graciously pleased out of 'your most religious and tender concern for the Church of Eng- 'land, (*whereof your Majesty is the only Supreme Head on earth,*) 'and for the poor clergy thereof,' &c. A complimentary expression, contained in a parenthesis of a preamble of a Bill, and addressed to a particular Sovereign, cannot and does not 'bestow' 'the title of Supreme Head of the Church of England' upon 'our Sovereigns,' when that title had been deliberately, and in so many words, rejected by two Acts, which are still the law of the land. There is a very simple test by which we can learn whether or no this title does 'belong to our Sovereigns by Act of Parliament,' or no. In the *Rotuli Parliamenti* the name and titles of the Sovereign are prefixed to the statutes of each year. Is this title found among the rest? It is found from the year 1534 to the year 1553; *i.e.* from the year in which it was granted by 26 Henry VIII. c. 1, to the year before that in which it was abrogated by 1 Philip and Mary, c. 8. It is never found after that date. Does it not follow that the title in question did by Act of Parliament belong to our Sovereigns from A.D. 1534 to A.D. 1553, and not before or afterwards?

Queen Elizabeth gave her reasons for refusing to revive it, and Bishop Jewel has handed them down to us; 'The Queen 'is not willing to be styled in speech or in writing the Head of 'the English Church; for she says forcibly that that dignity 'has been given to Christ alone, and is not suitable for any 'mortal: moreover, that those titles have been so foully defiled 'by Antichrist, that they cannot be piously employed by any 'one for the future.'[1] And in a like spirit King James I.: 'It 'is certain that the Apostles thought none worthy of this honour '(the title *Caput fidei*) but Christ; therefore this kind of title 'ought to have been abstained from, for whose dignity Christ 'alone is sufficient.'[2]

[1] Ep. xiv. ad Bulling., May 22, 1559. Zurich Letters, First Series, Camb. 1842. England and Rome, p. 88.

[2] Apol. pro Jur. Fidelitatis.

Digitized by Google

But offensive as the name is, we utterly deny that it ever bore, or was intended to bear, the signification which Mr. Wilberforce attaches to it. He says that 'the ground on which it was import-'ant' was, that 'it implied that the Bishops, who stood to Henry 'in the relation of subjects, were combined *by that circumstance* 'into a body, or spiritual entity' (p. 228). Bishop Gardiner is an authority which Mr. Wilberforce ought to accept. He gives the reason for the title, the adoption of which he warmly advocated, thus: 'Since the Church of England is at this day composed of 'the same persons, as are signified under the word Kingdom, of 'whom the prince is the head, when they are termed the King-'dom of England, shall he not be the head of *the same persons* 'when they are called the Church of England?'[1] And Cranmer, as is well known, declared that Nero was Head of the Church in the same sense as Henry; 'for Nero was Head of 'the Church, that is, in worldly respects, of the temporal bodies 'of men of whom the Church consisteth.'[2] Mr. Wilberforce will scarcely say that Cranmer held that Nero combined SS. Peter and Paul and the other Roman disciples into a spiritual entity. The real meaning of the title, ill-chosen and offensive as it is, and indeed only accepted at all by the Church with a reservation which Mr. Wilberforce acknowledges to have made it nugatory, was no more (except perhaps in the tyrant Henry's own acceptation,) than Supreme Governor; and the meaning of that name has already been given in the words both of the Church and of the Crown.

The attempt to fasten on Bramhall the doctrine that 'the powers thus possessed by the Crown,' (*i.e.* the powers by which the Churches were combined into a spiritual entity, &c.) 'were transferred to it from the Papacy' (p. 229), is an act of daring which we think might have been spared. Mr. Wilberforce is able to bring forward half a sentence, which, when removed from its context, might be so understood. It is as follows:—

'Whatsoever power our laws did divest the Pope of, they invested the king with it.' [There Mr. Wilberforce stops. Bramhall does not: he says] —'They invested the king with it; *but they never invested the king with any spiritual power or jurisdiction; witness the injunctions of Elizabeth, witness the public articles of our Church, witness the professions of King James, witness all our statutes themselves*, wherein all the parts of papal power are enumerated which are taken away, his "encroachments," his "usurpations," his "oaths," his "collations, provisions, pensions, tenths, first-fruits, reservations, palls, unions, commendams, exemptions, dispensations of all kinds, confirmations, licences, faculties, suspensions, appeals," and God knoweth how many pecuniary artifices more—*but of them all there is not one that concerneth jurisdiction purely spiritual*, or which is an essential right of

[1] De Ver. Obed. foll. 9, 11. England and Rome, p. 84.
[2] Fox xi. vol. iii. p. 550, Ed. 1684. England and Rome, p. 87.

Digitized by Google

the power of the Keys; they are all branches of the external regiment of the Church; the greater part of them usurped from the Crown. sundry of them from Bishops, and some found out by the Popes themselves.'—*Schism Guarded*, vol. ii. p. 458. Oxf. 1842.

In truth, this whole matter about combining the Churches into a spiritual body is infinitely unreasonable. Who combined the Churches of Corinth, Thessalonica, Philippi, and the other Churches planted by S. Paul, into 'spiritual entities?' Who combined S. John and the Ephesian clergy into a body? Was it Linus? or had S. John no powers of mission, jurisdiction and other functions, because the Ephesian Church had not 'crystallized' properly? How came the seven Churches of Asia to be bodies? What made the Patriarchate of Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople, &c., into entities? What made the thirteen Diocesan Churches have powers to rule themselves? How came the second Œcumenical Council to be so ignorant of the true principles of ecclesiastical 'crystallization,' as to order that, 'according to the canons,' the Bishops of Egypt, the East, Asia, Pontus, and Thrace, should severally and independently manage each their own affairs? What made the African Church into a body, whose letter to Pope Celestine (in which its members are forbidden, on pain of excommunication, to appeal beyond the seas and out of the realm of Africa) is the very anticipation of 24 Henry VIII. c. 12? One answer alone can be given to these and similar questions. They are combined into spiritual entities by their union with their one Head, the Lord Christ. Neither the Catholic Church of the early ages, nor the Anglican Church of the sixteenth century, regarded either the Bishop of Rome or the king of a country as the centre of unity, and the means of combining Christians into bodies. They held that the Churches of great cities and districts were independent of each other, and yet united to each other, by all depending alike upon the one Head, Jesus Christ; by being all bound together with the one bond of the Holy Spirit; by being all ruled by the one code of laws which found their expression in the canons of the Œcumenical Councils: but not cramped into the form of an ecclesiastical monarchy, under the rule of an earthly King-Bishop—not requiring, as of necessity, any organization superior to that of Bishops who are spiritually and ecclesiastically equal in powers and in functions, whether they are situated at Rome or at Engubium.'

It would take us too long to follow Mr. Wilberforce through his discussion of the state of the early British Church, and the acts of the Reformation, and unwind the threads of accuracy

Digitized by Google

and inaccuracy which are enfolded and entangled together. We shall but touch upon two more points; these are, Mr. Wilberforce's way of dealing with the Gorham case, and with the Greek Church. As to the merits of the first, we shall, of course, not here say one word; we shall only compare two passages, to see if there is to be found that 'just balance' which has been declared to be God's 'delight.'

'"The Church hath authority in controversies of faith." "The Church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies." This view of the Church of England, as claiming authority over the consciences, was dissipated by the Gorham case. It then became manifest that neither the rulers of the English Church, nor the Church herself in her corporate capacity, exert any such power, or claim to act on any such principles. . . . And this decision resulted from the further fact, that the civil power had taken possession, with the Church's assent, of her spiritual organs; her courts professed themselves bound to affirm or deny according as the temporal Sovereignty ordered them; and cannot claim, therefore, to be the expression of that mind of the Spirit which utters its voice through the body mystical of the Son of God.'[1]—P. 217.

Such is the measure meted out to the Church of England. Now compare the following passage:—

'The Donatists, after having been heard by Melchiades, Bishop of Rome, A.D. 313, and again by the Council of Arles, A.D. 314, obtained a personal hearing, A.D. 316, from Constantine. He heard them unwillingly, and avowed that he had no proper jurisdiction, but as he only confirmed that which had been decided by the Church, no particular evil resulted from the proceeding.'—P. 174.

Now, let the Gorham case be as Mr. Wilberforce represents it, yet, so far as the reference to the civil power goes, what is the difference between the appeal to Constantine in 316, and to Victoria in 1850? That Constantine decided one way or another way matters not; the whole principle is involved in the cause having been carried to him at all. We are not justifying such a course; we think it equally wrong in the case

[1] 'The justice of the decision,' we are further told, 'has been called in question, indeed, by many individuals; *but that such questions are to be decided by the civil power, and not by the Church, seems to be acquiesced in on all hands as inevitable* (p. 218). How true this statement is appears from the Clergy Discipline Bill, discussed by the Houses of Convocation at their very last sitting, Friday, Feb. 9, 1855. The Report of the Committee of the House of Bishops contains eighteen paragraphs, of which the 6th, 7th, 8th, 13th, 14th, 15th and 16th are all on this subject. With scarcely a dissentient voice the Church in representation has declared 'that the present provision for hearing and deciding final appeals is not such as to give satisfaction;' that 'it is highly important that it should be corrected;' that there ought to be 'security that ecclesiastical questions shall be decided by persons qualified by office and by acquaintance with the course of law ecclesiastical to decide them;' that the law which assigned the hearing of such causes to the Queen in Council ought to be repealed; that 'the best solution of the difficulty would be . . . to enable her Majesty . . . to remit the cause for rehearing in the Archbishop's Court, to be finally decided by the judge of that court, and other ecclesiastical and common-law judges.' This is acquiescence—acquiescence on all hands!

Digitized by Google

of Emperor and Queen alike; but what we call attention to is this: that whereas in the one case Mr. Wilberforce sees all claim on the part of the Church to authority in controversies of faith dissipated, the civil power taking possession of the Church's organs, and the mind of the Sovereign substituted for the mind of the Spirit; in the other absolutely similar case he has nothing to say but, that 'no particular evil resulted.'

The Greek Church has always presented a formidable difficulty to the advocates of the Supremacy of the Pope.

'The orthodox Greek or Eastern Church contains a body of Christians reckoned at not less than eighty millions. It is governed by Patriarchs and Bishops, holding their sees in continuous descent from the Apostolic age. It has produced saints, martyrs, and fathers. Since its separation from the West, it has converted the Sclavonic race, and added to its body the great Russian Church. It has retained the ancient creed without the change of an iota. It has never gone through the trials and dangers of a Reformation. It has ever spoken, and speaks still, with the voice of unbroken tradition, and it has *never* admitted the Papal sway. It has constantly, in every age, held up its voice and its witness against that claim as Antichristian and blasphemous, which says that "the Pope is set over the whole Christian world; and possesses in its completeness and plenitude that power which Christ left on earth for the good of his Church."[1] It has denied this, and any like claim, not merely for 300 years, but from the time that it has been advanced.'—*Papal Supremacy*, &c. p. 59.

Mr. Wilberforce feels the difficulty; and how does he meet it? He dismisses the whole question in a page and a half, with an *argumentum ad hominem* to the effect that the Anglican Church is not in communion with the Greek Church. Very true; but that was not the thing asserted, nor the thing which is needed for the argument. The controversial use, so to speak, which is made of the Greek Church by the Anglican Churchman is, to show in and by it that the Bishop of Rome is not the monarch of the Church, with whom to be in union is to hold communion with the Catholic Church. What reply to this argument is it to say, 'Oh! but you are not in communion with the Greek Church?' It does not touch the question in hand. But there are some striking admissions in the page and a half devoted to the Greek Church.

'However effective may be its testimony against the Church of Rome, its witness on behalf of the Church of England amounts to nothing. So that though it may be an useful weapon for those who deny that any such thing exists as Church authority, it cannot be relied on by those who desire to construct any system of belief, or hope to see any positive opinions prevail among mankind. Such seems the natural result of the three following considerations:—1st. The main doctrinal opposition between the Greek Church and the Church of Rome, respects the procession of the Holy Ghost; now on this point the Church of England is committed to the

[1] Bellarmine, De Pont. Rom. lib. i. c. 9.

Digitized by Google

self-same principles as the Church of Rome. . . . 2ndly. As the Church of England is opposed to Greece, in that particular in which Greece is most opposed to Rome, *so in all those points of doctrine in which she is opposed to Rome, she is equally opposed to Greece.* For there is hardly a tenet in which she has departed from the popular creed of the Western Church, in which the Eastern Church would not condemn her. How can we profess to be in communion then with the Eastern Church, when the Easterns agree with Rome respecting those very doctrines [the Supremacy for instance?] which the Church of England has been disputing for the last three centuries? 3rdly. There is a Bishop resident in the East who is called the Bishop of the United Church of England and Ireland in Jerusalem. . . . How then can it be said that the Church of England is in communion with the Church of Greece any more than with that of Rome? So that whatever use may be made of the Greek Church as a weapon against an opponent, it is useless for the purpose of justifying ourselves. Those who believe that God has His Church in the world, and that its purpose is to teach truth, will not be satisfied with arguments which are simply destructive, and which result only in the overthrow of all authority.'—P. 271.

Why Mr. Wilberforce should have asserted that 'in all those 'points of doctrine in which the Church of England is opposed 'to Rome, she is equally opposed to Greece,' we cannot presume to guess. Every one knows that it is not the case. All our readers probably are aware that on the doctrine of Purgatory, on the doctrine of Indulgences, on the doctrine of Communion in one kind only, on the doctrine of the Worship of Images, on the doctrine of the Celibacy of the Clergy, on the doctrine of the Free use of the Holy Scriptures, on the doctrine of Church Services in a tongue 'not understanded of the people,' and on many other doctrines, among which is to be specially counted the doctrine of Roman or Papal Supremacy, the Greek and the Anglican Churches agree in testifying or protesting against the innovations of Rome.[1] But we pass by this point, and we will say no more about the *ignoratio elenchi* exhibited throughout the reference to the Greek Church. What we say

[1] The very last authoritative document of the Oriental Church, the Evangelical Letter put forth by the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, in the year 1848, declares that the Papacy is the *great heresy* of later times, as Arianism of earlier ages; having ceased to be 'purely guided by the doctrines of the Fathers, and to walk by the never-to-be-forgotten rule of the Scriptures.' 'What then,' ask the Patriarchs of the East, 'must we conclude of those who pride and boast themselves only upon their succession to the supposed chair of S. Peter? . . . . It is easy to discern the emptiness and the weakness of the attempts by which the Bishop of Rome endeavours to maintain his despotic power. For if the Church of Christ had not been founded upon the indissoluble rock of the Confession of Peter, which was a common answer, as from each individual of the Apostles, to the question that was asked of all, "But whom do ye say that I am?" (as the godly Fathers both of the East and West interpret the place), it would have been built upon a frail foundation, and upon Cephas *personally*,—still, however, not in any sense on the Pope; and yet it is he who, moreover, appropriates to himself the Keys of the kingdom of Heaven; and what kind of use he has made of them is only too manifest from history.' Ἐγκύκλιος τῆς μιᾶς ἁγίας Καθολικῆς καὶ Ἀποστολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας Ἐπιστολή.—p. 19. Quoted in an excellent article in the first Number of the *Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal.*

Digitized by Google

is this. Mr. Wilberforce declares that the authority of the Greek Church 'may be an useful weapon for those who deny 'that any such thing exists as Church authority: it cannot 'be relied upon by those who desire to construct *any system of* 'belief, or hope to see *any positive opinions* prevail among man-'kind,' that 'those who believe that God has His Church in the 'world, and that its purpose is to teach truth, will not be satis-'fied with arguments which are *simply destructive,* and which 'result only in *the overthrow of all authority.*' But Mr. Wilberforce is not merely arguing against the Church of England,—he is constructing *some system of belief;* he does believe in *some Church authority.* Then he ought manfully to have grappled with this fact which is 'simply destructive' of all authority, and not to have slurred it over as incapable of meeting it. But the fact is, that Mr. Wilberforce has here made an exaggeration. It is not *every* system of belief, nor *every* positive opinion, nor *all* authority, which is overthrown by the argument derived from the existence of the Greek Church. This is clear; for the Greek Church itself has a system of belief, and holds positive opinions, and maintains Church authority, and yet is not overthrown by its own existence. Rather it is one particular system of belief and set of positive opinions, one particular mode of Church authority,—viz. that which energizes through the Papal power, which, indeed, Mr. Wilberforce has throughout the latter half of his volume been attempting to confuse with *all* Church authority,—of which the argument derived from the existence of the Greek Church is 'simply destructive.' Thus limited, we accept and ratify the admission. The existence of the Oriental Church is, indeed, 'simply destructive' of the Papal theory, and the argument derived from it 'results in the overthrow of all authority,' as it is claimed by Rome. This being so, it is the part of 'those who believe that God has His 'Church in the world,' and 'that any such thing exists as 'Church authority,' to adopt a theory which is not 'over-'thrown' by facts, but will account for them. Such is the theory of Church authority maintained by the Anglican Church.

We shall conclude this point with an extract from the *resumé* of 'Papal Supremacy,' &c.:—

'This doctrine of the Supremacy was unknown to—1. The ancient Councils of Nicæa, Constantinople, Ephesus, Chalcedon; which set before us another and distinct system of Church government, viz. the Diocesan or Patriarchal. 2. The ancient Liturgies, the depositories of Apostolic traditions; which also set before us the Patriarchal government of the Church. 3. The ancient Fathers; who neither in their interpretation of Scripture attribute a Supremacy to S. Peter, as modern Roman controversialists do, nor by their acts and writings acknowledge a Supremacy in the Bishop of Rome. S. Peter has with them the Primacy, the first place among the

Digitized by Google

Apostles; but it is distinctly and repeatedly denied, that he had any authority over the other Apostles, or any peculiar gifts or commission above the rest. And the Bishop of Rome stands foremost amongst his equal brother-Patriarchs. 4. The growth of the modern Roman Supremacy may be distinctly traced. It grew up chiefly under the shadow of a vast system of forgeries, which imposed on the whole Western Church for 700 years. 5. The Eastern Church, with its four Patriarchates, never submitted to the Roman Supremacy, but has continued its unbroken witness against the usurpation to the present day. 6. Our fathers, maintaining the Canon of the Church, rejected the Supremacy of the Pope as a usurpation, and not of lawful right. We conclude, that the sin of schism cannot, and does not, rest with us who lawfully maintain the ancient Canon and discipline of the Church. The guilt must be theirs who require unlawful terms of obedience.'—P. 67.

There is one final point on which we must say a few words. How is it that men like him whose book we have been reviewing, —men of honoured and respected name, and of general candour and integrity—can allow themselves, as soon as they undertake to reconcile Antiquity and Papal Supremacy, to make use of such shifts as we have had to exhibit, to wrest and torture words in the way we have had to expose, and so to misrepresent antiquity (there is no other word for it), as we have seen in the case of S. Cyprian, S. Augustine, Hilary the Deacon, Eusebius, the Council of Sardica, the Council of Ephesus, and the Council of Chalcedon? The charitable hypothesis of second-hand quotations taken from manuals of Theology will not meet the case, for the writer has evidently an acquaintance with original works: nor can it be the deadening effect of Liguorian principles, for he has not been educated in them. The only manner of accounting for this phenomenon is that which has lucidly been expounded by one who has since acted in the way which he has himself described:—

'Now do I mean to accuse so serious and good a man as Bellarmine of wilful unfairness in this procedure? No. Yet it is difficult to enter into the state of mind under which he was led into it. However we explain it, so much is clear, that the Fathers are only so far of use in the eyes of Romanists as they prove the Roman doctrines, and in no sense are allowed to interfere with the conclusion which their Church has adopted; that they are of authority when they seem to agree with Rome, of none if they differ. . . . A Romanist, then, cannot really argue in defence of the Roman doctrines; he has too firm a confidence in their truth, if he is sincere in his profession, to enable him critically to adjust the due weight to be given to this or that evidence. He assumes his Church's conclusion as true, and the facts or witnesses which he adduces are rather brought to receive an interpretation than to furnish a proof. . . . Let us then understand the position of the Romanists towards us; they do not really argue from the Fathers, though they seem to do so. They may affect to do so in our behalf, happy, if by an innocent stratagem they are able to convert us; but all the while, in their own feelings, they are taking a far higher position . . . . They claim and use all documents of antiquity as ministers and organs of that one Infallible Church, which once forsooth kept silence, but since has spoken;

Digitized by Google

which by a Divine gift must ever be consistent with herself, and which bears with her her own evidence of Divinity.'—*Proph. Office*, p. 84.

When Mr. Wilberforce wrote his 'Inquiry into the Principles of Church Authority,' it is clear that he had already adopted this principle of interpreting antiquity by the authority of the modern Church, or, rather of one portion of the modern Church, instead of testing the modern Church by an appeal to antiquity. He was, therefore, unable to deal fairly by antiquity; and thus the individual is to a considerable degree exculpated, —at the expense, however, of his adopted system, which, in proportion as the individual is excused, is itself more deeply criminated.

Digitized by Google

ART. V. 1.—*A Scripture Argument against permitting Marriage with a Wife's Sister—a Clergyman's Letter to a Friend. By the* REV. JAMES AUGUSTUS HESSEY, D.C.L., &c. &c. Second Edition. London: F. & J. Rivington. 1850.

2.—*The Report of Her Majesty's Commission on the Laws of Marriage, relative to Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, examined in a Letter to Sir Robert Harry Inglis, Bart. M.P. By* ALEX. J. BERESFORD HOPE, M.P. Second Edition. London: James Ridgway, Piccadilly. 1849.

3.—*Against Profane Dealing with Holy Matrimony, &c. &c. By the* REV. JOHN KEBLE, M.A. *Vicar of Hursley.* Oxford: John Henry Parker. 1849.

WE intend here to institute a short inquiry into the grounds upon which marriage with a deceased wife's sister, which it is proposed now to legalise, has been declared to be contrary to the law of God—and we are induced to enter upon this subject by two reasons: 1stly, because we feel that, even if the minds of many are already settled upon the point, yet there may be some to whom a calm consideration of the matter may perchance minister satisfaction and relief, and some whose doubts we may be enabled in some degree to resolve—and, 2dly, because the leading advocates of the change proposed, profess an unwillingness to promote or sanction any act which can be clearly shown to be contrary to the law of God, as revealed in holy Scripture, and as still binding upon Christians.[1] The point upon which many minds are at issue is not, whether they should obey or disobey God; but firstly, whether God has really declared His will in opposition to such unions; and secondly, whether such a declaratory law, even if found in holy Scripture, was not simply part of the Levitical law, and so binding upon Jews alone as Jews, but is now abrogated, as regards Christians, and of no further force or validity.

Till this question is decided, it would seem that all other arguments in favour of a change, whether they have reference to an assumed expediency or propriety in such a change, or whether they be drawn from that most fallacious of all sources, the example of a multitude, are beside the mark and premature. For it is time then at length to inquire into the force and

[1] In page ix. of Report of Commission on Marriage, quoted by Mr. Beresford Hope in page 5, 'Some persons contend that these marriages are forbidden, expressly or inferentially, by Scripture. If this opinion be admitted, *cadit quæstio.*'

Digitized by Google

character of all such further arguments, when it has been demonstrated clearly and certainly, either that God has not spoken at all, or that He has even allowed, or at least not forbidden, such marriages.

The subject then, with which we propose to deal, is concerned with the two following questions:—

1st. Is the law of God, as revealed in holy Scripture, opposed or not to such marriages?

2d. If it is so opposed, is such a law to be regarded as merely Levitical, or as binding upon all men?

Now, before entering more particularly into the discussion of the first point of our intended inquiry, we may perhaps be allowed to remark as Churchmen, and as addressing mainly Church-readers, that our Church *has* spoken to her members plainly and authoritatively upon the subject:—first, in the Table of Prohibited Degrees, set forth by authority in 1563; and, secondly, by Canon xcix of 1603, which orders that Table to be set up in every church, and characterises it as containing 'degrees prohibited by the law of God.'

We see, then, that according to the view taken by our Church in the times of James I., and of our Reformers, (who framed that Table,) in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, these marriages were opposed to the law of God. We shall hereafter attempt to show that such also was the opinion, not only of the Christian Church from the earliest times, but of Jewish Rabbins and interpreters.

Upon what passages of holy Scripture then, it may be asked, was such a general opinion and consent grounded? What passages can we find which bear at all upon this point?

Now all parties in this discussion, whether they resist or advocate the change, seem to agree in referring to Lev. xviii. as to that part of Holy Writ, which, if any, has reference to the question in dispute: the one part deducing arguments from the clause contained in verses 7—17 inclusive; the other part depending upon verse 18, as even containing an argument for the lawfulness of such marriages.

For the meaning of Lev. xviii. verses 7—17, as for the general argument which we shall have to state at length, we shall make frequent reference to the very able pamphlet, put forth by Dr. Hessey in 1850, which we have placed at the head of this article, and we avail ourselves of this opportunity, once for all, of recommending to the thoughtful perusal of all, who may be anxious to see in a clear argument what can be said upon this subject, so satisfactory and valuable a document.

Dr. Hessey, after having quoted at length the passage under consideration, tests by it each member contained in the Table of

Digitized by Google

Prohibited Degrees, and shows how every one of the connexions there forbidden is denounced either in express terms or by implication and converse analogy in the words of Holy Writ.

We say, then, with Dr. Hessey, that in ver. 16 is contained the declaration of God against marriage with a deceased wife's sister, and deduce our proof in this way: we find in that verse a prohibition against a man's marriage with his brother's wife—*i. e.* a woman may not marry two brothers; and analogously, (for the relationship is of a corresponding character in both cases,) a man may not marry two sisters, therefore not his wife's sister.[1]

Now it is to be remarked that, for the establishment of this proof, *two* assumptions have been made; viz., 1, the law of analogous inference as applicable to the case; and 2. the relationship of affinity as binding the persons concerned equally with the bond of consanguinity.

Some have objected to this mode of arguing, and have assumed that no prohibition ought to stand good but that which is laid down in so many words. Let us again follow Dr. Hessey's lead, and see into what difficulties and inconsistencies such an objection, if allowed to be good, would conduct us. He takes in illustration two cases similar to the one in dispute, and shows that it is only by inference, and not by direct words, that an uncle may not marry his niece, nor even a father his daughter:

'Those, therefore, who will admit nothing but what is set down in so many words to be Scripture, are brought to this—they must either allow all these inferences, or none of them.'—P. 11.

Besides,

'There is another strong reason for the admission of inferences. The prohibitions on the woman's side of the table are all of them of this character. The restrictions upon marriage in the chapter of Leviticus are addressed to men. We *infer* the woman's side from what *is said* to men.'—P. 11.

It really does seem to us unaccountably strange, that any objection should be raised, or seriously entertained, against the validity of such a law of inference, as applicable to the chapter or the case which is now especially under our notice; when not only the directions contained in this chapter, but the whole Law given by Moses, (except in two or three cases which especially relate to the female sex,)—and may we not add, not only the Law given by Moses, but *every* general code of laws?—has its provisions addressed to *men*, and only to *women by inference* through the other sex. And if this indeed be the rule, why should we feel any especial difficulty in admitting the application

[1] By a similar line of argument, the marriage of a man with his wife's niece is forbidden in ver. 14—the other class of marriage, the legalisation of which is being attempted by the Bill now before the House of Commons.

Digitized by Google

of that rule to the present case, or in considering that the prohibition contained in ver. 16, against marrying a brother's wife, is really looked at, as is usual, from the man's point of view, and is equally conclusive against the correlative marriage; viz, with a wife's sister; that is to say, a man may not take his brother's wife, *therefore* a woman may not take her sister's husband?

So much then we say in answer to the objection which has been entertained by some against the argument from analogy. In reply to the second objection raised against affinity as occupying a like position with consanguinity in the matters of marriage, we shall do no more than refer our readers to the mysterious language of holy Scripture, in which husband and wife are represented as made one in and by marriage—'one flesh'—united with each other by a higher and closer bond of connexion than even that of blood, and in each other united also with every one who is bone of their bone, and flesh of their flesh.

The law of God in the chapter before us treats unions by consanguinity or affinity in the same way, as standing on the same ground;[1] and it is worthy of remark, that the only two cases of incest which are mentioned in the New Testament, viz. those of Herod, S. Mark vi. 18, and the guilty Corinthian, 1 Cor. v. 1, are cases of connexion by affinity. Mr. Beresford Hope's searching Review of the Report made by the Commission, appointed in 1847 to inquire into the laws of marriage, which we have placed with Dr. Hessey's and Mr. Keble's pamphlets at the head of this article, as containing much valuable information with respect to the character of the evidence which was brought before the Commissioners, throws some light upon the opinions which were held by the various witnesses upon this question of affinity. We would call attention especially to the evidence of Archdeacons Sinclair, p. 92, and Hale, pp. 94—96, and to the petition of the Clergy of Down, Connor, and Dromore, pp. 150, 151, as confirming our own view of the matter, and quote the words of Mr. Beresford Hope himself as corroborative of the same position. In remarking upon a case men-

[1] We may perhaps be allowed here to refer our readers to Mr. Keble's tract, published in 1849, under the title, 'Against Profane Dealing with Holy Matrimony,' where he speaks as follows upon this point:—"Here, (*i. e.* in the verses 7—17 of Lev. xviii.) are thirteen cases in all; six of kindred by blood, and seven of kindred by marriage; and neither by the order in which they follow one another, nor by any difference of expression regarding them, is any hint given, that the one sort of profanation is less heinous in God's sight than the other. The world may come to think there is a difference, because the world will not believe that man and wife are really one flesh. But the written law of God apparently deals with both alike." —P. 13.

Digitized by Google

tioned in the evidence, in which union of a man with his wife's mother was charged in the Law Courts as incestuous, he says—

'It may be obtuseness or obliquity of moral feeling on my part, but I confess that I cannot understand why, marrying a wife's mother being acknowledgedly incestuous, there can be so little harm in marrying a wife's sister. The permissibility of the latter alliance must rest upon marriage not creating a relationship between the husband and the wife's family, similar to that existing between him and his own—on him and his wife not being "one flesh" in this sense. If marriage does create such relationship, it would be hardly credible that so near a relation as the sister of her who is "one flesh" with one, could be a person with whom a marriage could, without loss of purity, be contracted. But, on the other side, if such a relationship is not created, where is the pollution of an alliance with your wife's mother, a woman no way connected with you by blood? Either both must be, as far as I can understand, lawful, or both unlawful.'—P. 90.

If then we may in fairness, as all hold that in some cases we must, allow of the argument from analogy—if affinity does indeed unite man with man by ties which correspond with the bonds of blood-relationship, as the constant interpretation of holy Scripture would lead us to believe—then in Lev. xviii. 16 is contained virtually a declaration of the great God of all the families of the earth against marriage with a wife's sister—a declaration, which, except it be proved either to have been qualified by any other subsequent law, or to have been intended for Jews alone, and so to have become abrogated as regards Christians, must be held to be still of divine force and obligation.

It will be seen that we have qualified our conclusion by two supposed or supposable exceptions. They are not altogether imaginary ones, but have been, we fear, causes instrumental in attaching a large number of too-willing adherents to that party which is promoting, with a zeal worthy of a better cause, the abrogation of a law which we, in common with our forefathers, hold to be divine. They are exceptions which have often been brought forward, we have too much reason to fear, to suggest doubts to wavering minds about the real truth of the case, or to allay scruples with respect to a line of conduct which, while passion or inclination prompted them to adopt, conscience hesitated to believe to be after all the right course. We believe that many, who have been led to enter into such incestuous and unholy unions, have perhaps been induced to take the final step upon the representation and with the hope that such marriages, though contrary to the laws of England, nevertheless either were sanctioned by Lev. xviii. 18, or were perhaps part only of the Levitical law, and had so passed away with the Jewish economy.

We know that some, even amongst the clergy, have been kept back from vigorously opposing the introduction of the proposed change, by a latent feeling that though forbidden alike by the laws

Digitized by Google

of the land and of the Church, yet, as regards their prohibition in holy Scripture and validity amongst Christians, the incestuous character of such unions may be after all but one member of that large class of so-called 'open questions,' which threatens to engulf so many of the most hallowed and precious doctrines of our faith.

We should, therefore, have given a very incomplete view of the whole subject if we did not proceed to show, not only that in Lev. xviii. 16 we have a Divine law prohibitory,—but that this law is not invalidated or affected by ver. 18, nor addressed even to Jews as a Levitical but as a moral law. The discussion of these two points will lead us, therefore, to the completion of the line of argument which was laid down by us at the beginning of this article: the first objection bringing into view the investigation of the other part of Lev. xviii., which has been alleged as bearing favourably upon the change proposed; the second objection directing us to the second great branch of our subject, which has reference to the proper weight of the scriptural argument as applied to the present time.

What, then, is the fair interpretation of Lev. xviii. 18?

We here, again, agree with Dr. Hessey, that though this verse may have been frequently quoted and used as bearing upon the point at issue, it has really, upon investigation, nothing to do with the matter. We believe, and shall endeavour to show, that ver. 18 has a probable reference to bigamy or polygamy, and to nothing else.

Our reasons for this assertion are as follows:—

1st. *From the order of prohibitions* in the chapter.

Now from ver. 6—17 we have one class, and one class only, referred to, viz. marriages amongst persons already connected *by consanguinity or affinity*, introduced by the general heading in ver. 6: 'None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin to him.'

Passing by ver. 18 for the present, we find in ver. 19 another sort of prohibition; in verses 20, 21, cases of adultery, (i.) literal, (ii.) spiritual, *i.e.* idolatry; in verses 22, 23, cases of unnatural crimes.

Now it is to be observed, that one case remains unnoticed in a catalogue of forbidden unions, that of 'bigamy' or 'polygamy;' and where, humanly speaking, would its natural place be in the scale but between verses 17 and 20, where, in fact, we find a prohibition which seems, even at first sight, obviously to refer to this sin? That it really does so refer to 'bigamy' we shall see some probable reason for believing, when we inquire into the passage more in detail.

To this interpretation, derived from the contents of the

Digitized by Google

chapter, we would add a corroborative proof from its grammatical structure. We refer our readers to the Hebrew text, where they will find that each verse, from ver. 7 to ver. 17 inclusive, begins with the same word (אֲשֶׁר ס), and even in the mere reading evidently introduces a fresh subdivision of one main topic: but at ver. 18 a change takes place, and verses 18—23 inclusive begin in a way differing from that of the preceding verses, yet each in the same way as compared one with another, and implying, as would, we think, at once strike the Hebrew reader, the commencement of fresh classes of subject (the conjunction ו, in verses 21 and 23 ו.)

2dly. *From the critical analysis of the passage.*

We give the Hebrew, Septuagint, and English versions in order:—

וְאִשָּׁה אֶל אֲחוֹתָהּ לֹא תִקָּח לָצֺרֺר לְגַלּוֹת עֶרְוָתָהּ עָלֶיהָ בְּחַיֶּיהָ

The Septuagint: 'Γυναῖκα ἐπὶ ἀδελφῇ αὐτῆς οὐ λήψῃ ἀντί-'ζηλον ἀποκαλύψαι τὴν ἀσχημοσύνην αὐτῆς ἐπ' αὐτῇ, ἔτι ζώσης 'αὐτῆς.'

English Version: 'Neither shalt thou take a wife (margin '"or, one *wife to another*, Exod. xxvi. 3"), to her sister, to vex '*her*, to uncover her nakedness, beside the other in her life '*time*.'

Now it is obvious that the three special circumstances upon which the real meaning of this passage must rest, are, 1st, the person concerned: 2d, the reason of the prohibition: 3d, the limit of the prohibition.

We must beg, at the risk of being tedious and prolix to our readers, to say a word or two upon each of these points:—

1st. *The person*: 'a wife to her sister.' Of course the interpretation of the word 'sister' is of greatest importance to the matter in hand: for what if it shall turn out that 'sister' does not necessarily mean 'sister' proper, *i.e.* sister by blood—but 'sister,' even as a member of the same faith, or of the same nation, or of the same human race; even as a man calls his fellow-men, 'brethren'? If this, we say, should turn out to be really or *probably* the case, then farewell to all the weight which has been added to the scale of scriptural evidence by the impugners of our laws, in favour of their attempted change. Now as a fact we find that the masculine אח, of which אחת, 'sister,' is the feminine form, is used for 'a person connected or consociated with us in whatever manner.'

The word (אח, a brother), is, in fact, found employed in holy Scripture in all the following senses:—for a man, by *kindred*, as brother proper, Gen. iv. 2; or near relation, Gen. xiv. 14: or by *nation*, as fellow-countryman, Lev. xxv. 46, 47, Numb. xxv. 18: or by *similarity of condition or manner*, as in Job. xxx. 29,

Digitized by Google

'I am a brother to dragons:' or by *merely partaking of the same nature,* as a man to a man, Lev. xix. 17: or, lastly, *generally by expressing likeness,* as Prov. xviii. 9, and Ezek. xviii. 10.[1]

Hence we see that the word is used in the masculine in the very vaguest sense. Are we, then, to assert positively that (אחות) 'sister' in the feminine, *must* mean in this passage 'sister' in its strictest sense? or may we not fairly suppose, (except indeed, as is not the case here, the context definitely fixes the meaning to this restricted sense,) that the same vagueness which at times, and in fact most frequently, belongs to the masculine form, is capable of application to the feminine form also; so that 'sister' may mean 'one woman in relation to any other woman,' even as we saw above that 'brother' actually is used, in the *very next chapter* of Leviticus, to mean a man in relation to his fellow-man?—even as we have the word ἀδελφή used in the New Testament (1 Cor. ix. 5),[2] similarly with its masculine form, ἀδελφός?

But we are not left entirely to doubt and conjecture with regard to this use; for, i. we believe that we are right in saying, after a careful examination of the Pentateuch, that in no one instance throughout the laws given by Moses (except, indeed, it be in the passage before us) is either 'brother' or 'sister' used in its restricted sense, for relations by blood or kin, without a clue to this definite meaning being at the same time furnished by the context; and ii. in truth, the phrase here used, 'a woman to her sister' must, in strict propriety, be taken as a whole, and seems to have been a proverbial expression, meaning simply 'one to another.' Our marginal reading witnesses to this fact, where we find, for the words in the text, the passage rendered as follows: 'one wife *to another*,' with a reference to Exod. xxvi. 3, where we have the very same phrase twice, as applying to inanimate things, *the curtains of the tabernacle* coupled 'one to another,' *i. e.* in the Hebrew,[3] 'a woman to her sister;' and again, Ezek. i. 9 uses the very same expression for the *wings of the cherubim*, 'joined one to another,' in ver. 23, 'one toward the other,' and in chap. iii. 13, 'one another.' Nor is this proverbial mode of expression found in the feminine alone; but, when so used, it is simply the equivalent phrase (used where

[1] Ezek. xviii. 10: 'If he beget a son that is a robber, a shedder of blood, or doeth the *like* to any of these things,' where, in margin, 'to his brother any of these things,' but rather, perhaps, more accurately, 'the brother of any of these things.'

[2] Μὴ οὐκ ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα περιάγειν, &c. Compare with this expression the title given by the bridegroom to the bride in the Song of Solomon, 'My sister, *my* spouse,' iv. 9, 10, 12; v. 1.

[3] אשה אל אחתה. The same phrase occurs in three other places in the chapter, and is translated differently in each place, viz. in ver. 5, 'one of another,' in ver. 6, 'simply together,' and in ver. 17, 'one against another.'

Digitized by Google

the nouns with which it is connected are of the feminine form) for a corresponding masculine form, 'a man to his brother,' 'a man and his brother,' which occurs no less than twenty-one times in the Hebrew Bible, and is translated in all cases except one (Ezek. xxxiii. 31, where 'brother' appears) by the same indefinite words, 'one—another.' And it is further not unimportant to remark, that of these twenty-one instances no less than thirteen occur in the books of Moses, and three in Ezekiel (the very parts of Holy Scripture in which alone the feminine equivalent above-mentioned is found); that in only three instances does it refer to those who were in point of fact brothers (Gen. xxxviii. 19; xlii. 21, 28), and in two cases it is used (as the feminine form in Exod. xxvi. 3) with reference to inanimate objects, *the faces of the cherubims* 'one to another.' Exod. xxv. 20 and xxxvii. 9.

Here, then, we have an expression occurring in the masculine and feminine forms, according as it is joined with masculine or feminine nouns, no less than thirty times in the Bible, and in twenty-nine cases used in the same vague and indefinite way. Shall we then assert that in the thirtieth instance (viz. in Lev. xviii. 18), and in that alone, the indefinite *must* become definite, and the phrase drop its general character?

We think that with such an overwhelming preponderance of evidence in favour of our interpretation, we might safely use the strongest expressions to declare our conviction of its truth; but this we will boldly assert, that, to say the least, no stress of *necessity* can be laid upon the English word 'sister' here used, as implying any more than the relation in which any one woman stands to any other woman: and we think that we are not without every show of reason on our side, when we assert that the passage would seem to have no reference to the marriage with a wife's sister, but rather to the sin of 'bigamy,' or 'multiplying wives.'

2d. We proceed now, secondly, *to the reason given for the prohibition*, which, it is to be remarked, is of an entirely different character from those which preceded. It is not now 'because she is thy sister,' *i.e.* by affinity as wife's sister, nor 'because she is thy kinswoman,' nor 'because it is wickedness,' reasons which apply to the foregoing cases,—but 'to vex her.'

The Hebrew word צרר (an intensive form of the simple verb צר) seems to be used in all cases for 'greatly afflicting or distressing,' as Numb. xxv. 17, 'Vex the Midianites,' in punishment for their enticing Israel into sin. Diodati (quoted by Parkhurst) renders the word here used by 'per esser la sua rivale,' which shows at least his sense of the reason of the prohibition. The same word is used in a substantive form in 1 Sam. i. 6, a passage

Digitized by Google

which has a very strong bearing upon this verse, where Peninnah, one of the wives of Elkanah, is said to be 'an adversary'[1] to Hannah, and we know how, as her 'adversary' or 'rival,' 'she provoked her sore for to make her fret.'

The use, too, of the Hellenistic word ἀντίζηλος in this passage as equivalent to the Hebrew צרר, is well worth observing.

It is employed twice in the same sense in the apocryphal book of Ecclesiasticus, and in both cases with reference to one woman as the rival of another, xxvi. 6. ἄλγος καρδίας καὶ πένθος μέγα γύνη ἀντίζηλος ἐπὶ γυναικί, and again in xxxvii. 10, 11, μὴ βουλεύου . . . . μετὰ γυναικὸς περὶ ἀντιζήλου αὐτῆς.

We may, perhaps, be allowed to add in illustration from the *Mishna* of the Jews, that the several wives (or concubines) of a man are called צרות, (literally 'troubles') to each other, 'inasmuch as,' Kimchi observes in his commentary on 1 Sam. i. 6 (the passage before referred to), 'they are most often sources of trouble, jealousy, and vexation.'

We infer, then, from the foregoing observations, that the reason given for the prohibition confirms our interpretation of the meaning of the word 'sister,' and of the character of the whole verse.

3d. But if *the reason* of the prohibition remained doubtful, the doubt would be cleared away by *the limit of time* which is added: 'beside the other in *her lifetime*.' It is only during the lifetime of the first wife that a second wife added can be a vexation and trouble to her; hence 'bigamy' is the sin prohibited by the verse: but at the death of the first wife, the man is free to marry again,—yet not, as some have tried to make the verse to imply, free even now to marry the sister of his former wife: for that relationship has been already forbidden by the terms of the 16th verse, and the sister of the deceased wife remains as much a sister by all the ties of affinity after the death of her sister, as she was during her lifetime.[2]

We say, then, in concluding our inquiry into the scriptural argument as deduced from Lev. xviii. that ver. 18 has no

[1] The word 'adversary' in Hebrew, צרר, is a substantive form connected with the verb צרר, 'to vex,' used in Lev. xviii. 18.

[2] An objection may be supposed to lie against the above interpretation of Lev. xviii. 18, as if polygamy was permitted by God in Deut. xxi. 15, but we should conceive it to be just as difficult to extract from the last-named passage a Divine sanction for such a practice, as to derive from Deut. xvii. 14—20, an approval of the conduct of the Israelites in after times in choosing a king. Both passages, in fact, seem to occupy similar ground, as providing rules which were to be observed when, as the Lord who knew the hardness of their hearts foresaw, the special occasions which would require the application of such rules should arrive. We may further observe, that Deut. xxi. 15 stands in the midst of a series of rules of conduct, to be observed under difficult circumstances, and after improper acts. See Deut. xxi. 1, 10, 18, 22.

Digitized by Google

bearing upon the question at issue, but refers to a different class of prohibitions; and that in ver. 16 is contained virtually a specific declaration of the Divine will in prohibition of such marriages. We assert that neither at the same time nor in succession is a man permitted by the law of God to take in marriage *two* sisters: and we ground our reasoning upon the two arguments of analogy and affinity.

Nor is this any novel method of interpretation; for we shall be enabled to show, (and we would fain hope in a way which will prove satisfactory to our readers,) that it is from ver. 16 and in reliance upon *these arguments*, that not only our Church, but the early Church, and the Jews themselves, have asserted and laid down the rule hitherto observed as of Divine authority.

Beginning with our own Church authors, we shall trace back the recognition of this law in the early Church, and then by reference to Jewish authorities show how, as matter of fact, modern and ancient Churches, Christians and Jews, have, often unwittingly to each other, agreed in one common belief and practice on this point.

We have already referred to the Table of Prohibited Degrees set forth in 1563, and to the Ninety-ninth Canon, (which establishes that Table as based on warrant of holy Scripture,) as authoritative exponents of the mind of our Church-rulers in the reigns of Elizabeth and James.

We shall bring forward Wheatley as our first witness, because he has explained at great clearness and length the way in which that Table is to be viewed and interpreted. In his 'Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer' he writes as follows:—

'It may not be amiss to observe that several degrees are expressed in the Table which are not mentioned particularly in the 18th of Leviticus, *which is the place upon which the Table is founded.* But then they may be inferred by *parity of reason.* For that passage in Leviticus only mentions those relations evidently and expressly which may help us to discover the like difference and degrees. So that for the right understanding of the 18th of Leviticus, and to bring it to an agreement with the Table in our Common Prayer Books, we must observe *two particular rules* for our direction:—

'1. That the same prohibitions that are made to one sex are undoubtedly understood and implied to the other.

'2. That a man and his wife are accounted *one* flesh: (so that whoever is related to one of them by means of consanguinity is in the same degree related to the other by means of affinity, insomuch that the husband is so much forbid to marry with his wife's relations, and the wife with her husband's, within the degrees prohibited, as either of them are to marry with their own.) Thus, for instance, though *marrying a wife's sister* be not expressly forbid in the 18th of Leviticus, yet by parity of reason it is virtually implied. For when God there commands (ver. 16) that a man shall not marry his brother's wife,—which is the same as forbidding the woman to be married to her husband's brother,—it follows of course that a man is also forbid to marry his wife's sister; for between one man and two sisters, and

Digitized by Google

one woman and two brothers, is the same analogy and proportion.'—*Wheatley, Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer, London,* 1840, p. 396.

He then proceeds to show that in like manner, as we have seen above, a man is forbidden to marry his deceased wife's niece, and to refer to the decision of our Law Courts, which we shall mention more at length presently.

These observations of Wheatley are grounded upon the *Reformatio Legum* (A.D. 1553), quoted by Gibson in his Codex, vol. i. p. 498, from which, in fact, Wheatley's remarks are a literal translation. Gibson in referring to the original words says:—

'Upon the foregoing rule, from parity of reason (which we also find to be acknowledged and laid down by the Books of Common Law) rests the prohibition against marrying *a wife's sister*, which I cannot better explain than in the words of Bishop Jewel, in his printed letter upon that point:—"Albeit I be not forbidden by plain words to marry my wife's sister, yet am I forbidden to do so by other words, which by exposition are plain enough. For when God commands me, I shall not marry my brother's wife, it follows directly by the same that he forbids me to marry my wife's sister. For between one man and two sisters, and one woman and two brothers, is like analogy and proportion."'[1]

The letter, of which the above extract forms part, seems to have been written in A.D. 1561, about the time when Archbishop Parker, lately advanced to the See of Canterbury, had issued his admonition against unlawful marriages, amongst the provisions of which we find, 'Fratris uxorem ducendi, vel duobus 'sororibus conjungendi, licentiam penitus submovemus.' (Strype, Parker, vol. i. pp. 174, 175. Oxford Edition.)

In the Lambeth Articles of the same year we also find the following rule laid down:—

'It is agreed that all such marriages as have been contracted within the Levitical degrees be dissolved, and namely those who have married *two sisters one after another*, who are, by common consent, judged to be within the case.'—*Cardwell, Doc. Ann.* i. 267.

These particulars have an especial bearing upon our inquiry, as showing the mind of the Church Reformers at that period; for it must be borne in mind that no longer time than two years elapsed after the letter of Jewel, before the Table of Prohibited Degrees was published by Archbishop Parker in 1563. In the

[1] The whole letter, from which the above is an extract, is printed in Strype, (Parker, vol. iii. pp. 55—58. App. No. XIX. Oxford edition.) It was written in answer to an inquiry made to him upon the legitimacy of such marriages, which appear to have become prevalent during the disorders of those times, and seem to have been considered allowable by some foreigners, (he mentions Pellicanus, Paulus, Fagius and Lyra,) who took Lev. xviii. 18 strictly. This view he condemns, and then proceeds to show the necessity of the argument from analogy, adding after the words quoted by Gibson, 'And other such like ought to be taken for a rule. And therefore the Rabbins of the Jews have expressly forbidden divers degrees by this rule, which God by plain words forbade not.' See also Le Bas' Life of Jewel, chap. v. pp. 101—104.

Digitized by Google

year following, viz. 1563-4, we have the contents of this Table called 'Leviticall Degrees,' and their observance enjoined by the 'Book of Advertisements,' where we read:—

'Item, That no persons be suffered to marye within the Leviticall Degrees, mentioned in a Table set forthe by the Archebysshoppe of Caunterburye in that behalfe, A.D. 1563, and if any suche be, to be separated by order of lawe.'

And again, in 1571, the Table was enforced in similar language by *Canons*, amongst which we again find particular stress laid upon the marriage which is under consideration:—

'Omnia matrimonia quæ uspiam contracta sunt intra *gradus cognationis aut affinitatis*[1] *prohibitos in* xviii. *Levitici* authoritate Episcopi dissolventur: *maxime* vero, si quis *priore uxore demortuâ*, ejus sororem uxorem duxerit: hic enim gradus communi doctorum virorum consensu et judicio putatur in Levitico prohiberi.'—*Sparrow, Coll.* p. 240.

We find further from Gibson, that the question of marriage with a wife's sister came under consideration in the King's Bench (25 Car. II. Mich. Term. Hill *v.* Good):—

'Though it was alleged that the precept, primâ facie, seemed to be only against having two sisters *at the same time*, and prohibition to the Spiritual Court was granted; yet in Trinity Term, 26 Car. II. after hearing civilians, they granted a consultation as in a matter within this statute, 32 Henry VIII. though the former statute (25 Henry VIII.) had never been revived after the repeal of Queen Mary, which yet it *virtually* was, and there, as in 25 Henry VIII., the wife's sister is expressly prohibited.'

We are here referred further back to the reign of Henry VIII., when it is to be carefully observed that a distinction was made between the degrees prohibited in Leviticus, and those additional degrees which the Church before the Reformation had herself imposed.[2] The former as binding by the Word of God

[1] The joint prohibition against consanguinity and affinity here referred to, was declared in the admonitions prefixed to Parker's Table:—

'II. It is also to be noted that consanguinity and affinity (letting and dissolving matrimony) is contracted as well in them and by them which be of kindred by the one side, as in and by them which be kindred by both sides.

'III. Item, that by the laws consanguinity and affinity (letting and dissolving matrimony) is contracted as well by unlawful company of man and woman as by lawful marriage.'

The Visitation Articles of Cardinal Pole, in 1557, hold the same language, where he makes inquiry, 'Whether any be married in the degrees of affinity or consanguinity prohibited by the laws of Holy Church?'—Cardwell, Doc. Ann. i. 174. And Dr. Burn witnesses to the same fact, when, after referring to the 'Levitical degrees' and 'prohibited degrees,' mentioned in the Acts of the 25th and 32d of Henry VIII., he adds, 'The degrees specified in these statutes are particularly set forth in Leviticus xviii., whereby not only degrees of kindred and consanguinity, but degrees of affinity and alliance, do hinder matrimony." (Eccl. Law. Phill. ii. 440.)

[2] By the Act of 25 Henry VIII. restriction was taken off all degrees of consanguinity or affinity, except those which were *condemned in express words* in Lev. xviii. The impropriety and evil consequences of such a course were seen at the time by Cranmer, who, by a letter addressed two years afterwards to Cromwell, and quoted by Cardwell (Doc. Ann. i. 282), seems to have remonstrated at the

Digitized by Google

were retained, the latter as imposed by man, and, therefore, within the power of man to abrogate, were set aside.

Having traced the opinion of our Church to the very time of its Reformation, we would now refer our readers several centuries backward to the times of the early Church. We find in Western Christendom, the Council of Auxerre, (Conc. Antissiod.) A.D. 578, laying down these *analogous* Canons, and so showing the ground of Scripture upon which its view was based:—

'Can. xxix. Non licet ut *relictam fratris* sui quis in matrimonium ducat.
'Can. xxx. Non licet, duas sorores, si *una mortua fuerit*, alteram in conjugium accipere.'

The brother's widow and the sister's widowed husband are placed on a similar footing; in the latter Canon, Lev. xviii. 18 is evidently ignored. A like rule appears to have been laid down in the Eastern Church, for in the *Codex Theodosianus*, lib. iii. tit. xii. *de incestis nuptiis*, we find a law of Theodosius Junior, the Emperor, in the fifth century, which conveys a similar prohibition. And in this case we may remark, that Honorius, the fellow-emperor of Theodosius, had at this very time married two sisters, daughters of Stilicho, successively, the one after the other. The law runs thus (leg. iv.):—

'Tanquam incestum commiserit, habeatur qui post prioris conjugis amissionem sororem ejus in matrimonium proprium crediderit sortiendam. *Pari ac simili ratione* etiam si qua post interitum mariti in germani ejus nuptias crediderit adspirandum.'

A law of Constantius, bearing date of the preceding century, quoted also in the *Codex Theodosianus*, must be referred to in common fairness, as it seems to imply that some had thought themselves at liberty to enter into such unions in previous times. Its words are (leg. iii.):—

'Etsi licitum veteres crediderunt, nuptiis fratris solutis, ducere fratris uxorem: licitum etiam post mortem mulieris vel divortium contrahere

time of the passing of the Act, though to no purpose. His words are, 'By the law of God many persons be prohibited which be not expressed, but be understood by like prohibition in equal degree. As S. Ambrose saith, that the niece is forbid by the law of God, although it be not expressed in Leviticus that the uncle shall not marry the niece. But when the nephew is forbid there that he shall not marry his aunt, by the same is understood that the niece shall not be married unto her uncle. Likewise as the daughter is not there plainly expressed, yet when the son is forbid to marry his mother, it is understood that the daughter may not be married to her father, because they be of like degree..... And as touching the Act of Parliament concerning the degrees prohibited by God's law, they be not so plainly set forth as I would they were. Wherein I somewhat spake my mind at the making of the said law, but it was not then accepted' (Strype's Cranmer, i. 66). Dr. Cardwell proceeds, 'These views, and the frequent applications made to the archbishop for dispensations in cases prohibited in principle, but not forbidden by express words in the statute, led eventually to the formation of "The Table of Degrees," that was set forth by Archbishop Parker.'

Digitized by Google

cum ejusdem sorore conjugium: abstineant hujusmodi nuptiis universi, nec æstiment posse legitimos liberos ex hoc consortio procreari, nam spurios esse convenit, qui nascentur.'

It is evident, however, that even this law, though it may seem to favour the idea that marriages of the kind prohibited were previously allowed, shows that the permission of marriage with a wife's sister was deduced by analogy, not from Lev. xviii. 18, but from Deut. xxv. 5—10, which contains a provision in exception to Lev. xviii. 16; and, perhaps, even thus it may have followed, from a mistaken idea that the Levitical law, which for certain temporal purposes abrogated in certain cases the law laid down in Lev. xviii. 16, was still allowed to Christians; and if so, that its converse was also allowable. But however this may be, we have another contemporaneous law in another part of the Eastern Church, which speaks plainly upon the matter as it stood then.

S. Basil, A.D. 370, having fixed a penance of fifteen years as the punishment for adultery, lays down the same law for those who have contracted such a marriage as that with two sisters successively:—

'Can. lxxviii. *Ὁ αὐτὸς κρατείτω τύπος καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν δύο ἀδελφὰς λαμβανόντων εἰς συνοικέσιον, εἰ καὶ κατὰ διαφόρους χρόνους.*'

Passing to even an earlier period, and to a different Church-region, we find the Council of Illiberis (A.D. 307) determining, though in milder form than suited the monk Basil, the punishment for the same offence: Conc. Illib. Canon lxi.:—

'Si quis post obitum uxoris suæ sororem ejus duxerit, quinquennium à communione placuit abstineri, nisi forte dari pacem velocius necessitas coëgerit infirmitatis.'

And once more, to quote one of the earliest, if not the earliest, code of Church laws, the Apostol. Canons, dating probably from the third century at the latest, denounce against the same sin, the prohibition from the hope of becoming a cleric:—

Can. xviii. *Ὁ δύο ἀδελφὰς ἀγαγόμενος, ἢ ἀδελφιδῆν, οὐ δύναται εἶναι κληρικός.*

'The same evil mark,' as Mr. Keble in his Tract, p. 22, remarks, 'which in the 13th and 14th Canons of the same series is set 'upon bigamy, and upon other discreditable marriages, and in 'the 53d upon all kinds of unchastity.'

We have thus, at the risk of wearying our readers, given a sort of catena of Church authorities up to the earliest ages of Christianity. But we have not even yet finished our task, and must ask their patience for a further space, whilst we lay before them some evidence in proof that not only Christians of all ages have thus looked upon this question, but that Jewish Rabbins also, to whom Jewel alluded in the letter which we quoted above, both took the same view of holy Scripture, and

Digitized by Google

based it upon the same grounds of analogy and affinity. It is interesting, and we believe that it will be found useful to see, if we can, how as a matter of fact the Jews of old, often notoriously lax in their observance of the severer parts of the Law, regarded these matters.

Our first reference will be to Maimonides, a learned Spanish Rabbin of the twelfth century, who, in his celebrated book, entitled, 'The Reasons of the Laws of Moses,' thus writes upon prohibited marriages (p. 310)[1]:—

'Reasons of a similar nature existed also for the prohibition of incestuous marriages (Lev. xviii.); for the persons forbidden to be married to each other being such as usually lived together in the same house, opportunity for criminality would be easily found, and, though associating with each other, the judge could not have separated them from each other; so that if such persons could have married like others who were free and disengaged, and no punishment had been affixed to their marriage, the greater part of men would have been living in a state of constant unchastity.[2]

'Another reason for prohibiting such marriages, I apprehend, was to commend modesty and chastity. For such an union betwixt the *root* and *the branch* is the most glaring profligacy; for instance, for a man to marry his mother or daughter; therefore, marriage betwixt *root* and *branch* was forbidden. Nor does it constitute any difference whether the *root* marry the *branch*, or the *branch* the *root*, or whether they meet in marriage with a third person, as when any one marries both root and branch. On this account a man was forbidden to marry a woman and her daughter, or the wife of the father and the wife of the son, because these were marriages to root and branch.

'*Brothers* were considered as root and branch, and it was *therefore* forbidden to marry a *wife's sister* and a *brother's wife*, because this was uniting two individuals to a third person, who were, as it were, root and branch. Besides, since marriage among brothers was considered as root and branch, and even as one body, and was therefore forbidden, it was likewise forbidden to marry a mother's sister, because she was regarded as being the same as a mother; and a father's sister, who was considered as near as a father.'

So far Maimonides, whom we have quoted at some length, in order that the whole view in which this matter was regarded by him might be laid in its entirety before the reader. We may remark, however, that it is clear throughout, that he considers the connexion between individuals by marriage to be as effectual a bar to marriage as connexion by blood. His arguments may be thus briefly summed up: Brothers are forbidden to marry the same third person, because the husband's brother becomes by marriage as a brother to the wife. Therefore, sisters are forbidden to marry the same third person; because, in like manner, the wife's sister becomes by marriage as a sister to the husband.

[1] Our reference is to an English translation by Dr. Townley (published A.D. 1827), Chap. xxiv. p. 310, &c. 'Precepts of the 14th Class.'

[2] We cannot but commend this paragraph to the notice of those who would take up the social part of the subject.

Digitized by Google

Nor was this view of holy Scripture any mere invention of Maimonides, or of the Jews of his age, for the *Mishna* (which professes to give the oral law delivered by tradition from Moses, and is at least as old as the time of Rabbi Judah, who lived about A.D. 150) bears witness, though incidentally, and so with more force than if it had been of set purpose, to this interpretation of God's law; for we read in Book xxii., entitled 'Yebamoth,'[1] which treats of the obligation under the Law to marry a deceased brother's wife (Yeboom), and so to preserve his name and family, that there were certain circumstances which were ruled by the Rabbins (whether rightly or wrongly does not affect the question, which is merely one of fact) to render such an observance of the Law unlawful; as, for instance, 'if the parties were related to each other within the degree of 'consanguinity prohibited by the holy Law to intermarry.'

Chapter I. gives instances of such prohibitions. Fifteen classes of women are mentioned, who, on this ground, release themselves from this obligation, and amongst these we find the 12th case in order to be this, 'When the widow of the deceased is his (*i.e.* the surviving brother's) wife's sister.' In that case the law of Levirage was considered not to apply.

But the *Mishna* does not leave us with this general interpretation of the Law; it supplies us with cases in illustration of its actual working. Case 1, from chap. iii. §. 7.—

'When of three brothers, two are married to two sisters, and one to a stranger: if one of them who married the sisters died, and he who had married the stranger marries the widow; and then the wife of the second brother dies, and also the third brother, who had married the stranger; then the widow will be for ever prohibited to the second or surviving brother, because she was for some time prohibited to him [as wife's sister].'

That is, in other words, inasmuch as her sister had by her marriage brought her into connexion of affinity with the man, she can never afterwards be clear from such bond of affinity, and, therefore, *even after her sister's death*, remains as a sister to him.

Or, to make the matter clearer:—Three brothers, A, B and C, marry respectively M and N, two sisters, and S, a stranger. A dies, and C marries the widow M: then N dies, and also C, who leaves behind S and M; then B may marry S, but not M, because she was sister to his former wife N.

Case 2 is similar. (§. 9, at the end):—

'When of two brothers married to two sisters, one dies, and afterwards the wife of the surviving brother also dies, then he may not marry his brother's widow, because there was a time when she was prohibited to him [namely, during the life of his wife, her sister].'

[1] Our references are to the English translation of the Mishna, by 'De Sola and Raphall.' London: 1845.

Digitized by Google

To exemplify as before. Two brothers, A and B, marry respectively M and N, two sisters. A and N die; then B cannot marry M, because she is the sister of his former wife.

So strongly, then, did the Jews consider the prohibition *upon the warrant of God's law* as binding, that they even made it an exception to the fulfilment of that other particular provision, which, it may be observed, was permissive, and not obligatory, with respect to the 'raising up seed to a brother.' The latter gave way before, when it was found to clash with, the former law. Why, we may ask, was this? Was it not, because they judged that the one was a temporary and individual law, binding upon an Israelite as such, whilst the other was a moral and a general law of God, which bound by its provisions not Israelites alone, but all men. And this consideration naturally leads to that second question, which we laid down at the beginning of this article as necessary to be discussed: viz.—whether if, as we have attempted to show, holy Scripture has spoken in the way in which Christians and Jews have believed that it has spoken,—in denunciation of the marriage with a wife's sister,—such a law be not, after all, a law Levitical, not moral—a law for Jews, but not for Christians. A few words will be all which we shall deem it necessary to employ in answer to this objection, and we again avail ourselves of Dr. Hessey's pamphlet (pp. 4, 5):—

'1stly. The Israelites are warned at the commencement of Lev. xviii. against practising the abominations of the Egyptians and the Canaanites, (ver. 3); and the warning is repeated even more solemnly, so far as the Canaanites are concerned, at the conclusion of the chapter.[1] Now, neither of these nations could have transgressed the Jewish political law. It had not yet been laid down; and if it had, they had possessed no opportunity of becoming acquainted with it. Of course, therefore, they could not have been condemned or punished for transgressing it. Still they are condemned for transgressing the precepts mentioned in the chapter. These precepts, then, must be the reenactment of the principles of God's moral law, which those nations might have known, and which they could and did transgress.

'2dly. If the chapter relates to the Jewish political law at all, it must relate to it entirely. No distinction is discoverable in it by which the moral and political precepts can be separated. If some of them be political, all must be political, and therefore all must be abrogated, which no one will venture to affirm. If some of them be moral, all must be moral, and, therefore, all must be still binding upon Christians.

'3dly. Until nearly the end of the fifteenth century, the Church held the precepts of this chapter which relate to marriage to be moral, and, therefore, not to be tampered with or reversed. And the most ancient table of

[1] Lev. xviii. 24, 25. 'Defile not ye yourselves in any of these things; for in all these the nations are defiled which I cast out before you: and the land is defiled; therefore I do visit the iniquity thereof upon it, and the land itself vomiteth out her inhabitants.' .... ver. 30. 'Therefore shall ye keep mine ordinance, that ye commit not any one of these abominable customs, which were committed before you, and that ye defile not yourselves therein: I am the LORD your GOD.'

Digitized by Google

prohibited degrees, founded upon the chapter, was virtually the same as our own. I may add that the first recorded instance of any one of these degrees being dispensed with, took place towards the end of the fifteenth century, under one of the most infamous popes who ever filled the papal chair. It is true, that from the sixth to the fifteenth century the table of forbidden degrees was much extended; and it is true, also, that the degrees thus added beyond Scripture were frequently dispensed with. But they were dispensed with on the ground that they were merely ecclesiastical, not Scriptural, prohibitions; whilst the degrees in our table were never dispensed with, on the very ground that they were moral precepts, and part of the unalterable Divine law.

'I conclude, therefore, that Lev. xviii. is part of the moral law, and, therefore, binding upon Christians.'

What, then, we have tried to show is, that there is solid ground for believing that God has spoken, and spoken emphatically, in Lev. xviii. 16, against the marriages which it is now proposed to legalise. We have attempted to make it probable, that no Divine permission or allowance is to be deduced in favour of a change in the law from Lev. xviii. 18.

We have further argued that the laws laid down in that chapter were not so much Levitical as moral, binding on Jews, yet not as Jews, but as men—social, moral, religious beings—laws which have a force independent of the Jewish Law, which were in being before that Law was given, which continue equally in being ever since the requirements of that Law have passed away. We have adduced evidence to show that the arguments employed in our proof are such as have ever been held to be sound and valid, both by Jew and Christian,—as well by the early Church as by our own Church since the Reformation,—and have been the grounds upon which the belief and practice of ages have rested.

We would, in conclusion, ask our readers to weigh well the considerations which have been brought before their notice. If there be any to whose minds we have failed to bring entire conviction, to them we would beg leave to say, If your minds are still doubtful, if there be but a secret feeling that at least there is probability, though there may not be certainty, on our side, remember the words of Butler:[1]—

'In questions of difficulty, or such as are thought so, where more satisfactory evidence is not to be had, or is not seen: if the result of examination be, that there appears upon the whole, only the lowest presumption on one side, and none on the other, or a greater presumption on one side, though in the lowest degree greater; this determines the question, even in matters of speculation; and in matters of practice will lay us under an absolute and formal obligation, in point of prudence and of interest, to act upon that presumption or low probability, though it be so low as to leave the mind in very great doubt which is the truth. For surely a man is as really bound in prudence to do what upon the whole appears, according

[1] Butler's Analogy. Introduction, pp. xlix. l. London: 1841.

Digitized by Google

to the best of his judgment, to be for his happiness, as what he certainly knows to be so. Nay, further, in *questions of great consequence* a reasonable man will think it concerns him to remark lower probabilities and presumptions than these; such as amount to no more than showing one side of a question to be as supposable and credible as the other; nay, such as but amount to much less even than this.'

Consider the sides between which you have to choose, on the one hand, the preservation of the present law, with the probability of being on God's side, and on the other, the change in the law, with the chance of standing in opposition to the law of God. Add to the weight, in the former scale, the united voice and opinion of the wise and good of past ages, and your line of conduct can no longer remain doubtful.

Digitized by Google

NOTICES.

Two 'Catechetical Manuals,' and both bearing the authorship of Ramsay, reach us. The one is Dean Ramsay's (of Edinburgh), which in its seventh edition (Grant), may be supposed to have acquired a dignified elevation beyond the range of criticism. We should not ourselves have assisted to place it in so lofty a position, for we think it coldly correct as far as it goes, which is only about half-way, and heavy.—Mr. Arthur Ramsay, of Trinity College, Cambridge, in his 'Catechiser's Manual,' (Macmillan,) has given us a much more original and thoughtful work: his favourite study is etymology, and some of his little notes on the meaning of words in the Catechism are instructive and important. His taste for these verbal refinements is occasionally overdone: and we were surprised (p. 44) at Mr. Ramsay's adoption of Dr. Donaldson's apparent inversion of the use of the word 'gossip.' He seems to say that the word was used for a sponsor, because it signified, 'the most intimate and friendly conversation.' Whereas, being the technical name for a sponsor—God-sip—it came to be applied to vain and trifling talk, on account of the habit to which such affinities gave rise of indulging in familiar intercourses.

The author of 'Forest Scenes in Norway and Sweden,' (Routledge,) has not in the fishing-jacket of former years disqualified himself for the cassock of his present life, as his useful 'Sermons' and 'Guide to Confirmation' show. Mr. Newland, like Walton and Donne, is a fisher of men as well as of salmon. In either character he writes with entire good sense: and his love of anecdote and keen appreciation of character make him agreeable both as a tourist and a preacher. The 'Forest Life' contains more about the Scandinavian social and religious state than most professed volumes of travel. All that Mr. Newland writes flows agreeably.

'An Oxford M. A.' has sent us a pathetic appeal in favour of 'Public Nurseries.' (J. H. Parker.) What is to be said for and against infant schools—and the moral argument is not all on one side—applies to this scheme. It is at work in Portugal Street, Lincoln's Inn Fields; and its beneficial results on the child are unquestionable; that it throws the mother into an unnatural, if unavoidable, condition, is perhaps as plain.

We are glad to welcome the tenth part of the second volume of 'Instrumenta Ecclesiastica,' (Van Voorst,) a useful set of working drawings, published by the Ecclesiological Society. A list of tradesmen of whom the various articles may be procured would be found useful, particularly to colonial church builders.

Mr. J. H. Parker's 'Scripture Prints'—especially the glazed copies—are a vast improvement on our extant stock. But what is wanted for cottage walls is colour; and the Christian artist who would supplant the ugly but intelligible daubs which, both here and abroad, find such favour with the poor, by good and religious coloured designs, would be a benefactor of no small value. The thing is not impossible, though difficult. Uneducated

Digitized by Google

eyes are incapable of understanding miniature reproductions of the great Italian master-pieces; the style of fresco, and its broad masses of powerful colour, are alone suited for the common mind.

The 'Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology' (Macmillan) improves as it advances. The third number is the best, though its predecessors were of high promise. The English school of classical criticism is reviving.

Two volumes of Calvin's French Letters have been collected and published by M. Jules Bonnet, from the Archives of Geneva: 'Lettres de Jean Calvin.' (Paris: Meyrueis.) They form a supplement to the well-known Latin Letters, and the chief value of the present collection is, that they are from a recent collation, and form a complete series. The most valuable portion of M. Bonnet's volumes, Calvin's correspondence with M. de Falais, has been long before the world, and the letters on English ecclesiastical affairs are familiar to all students of the Reformation period. The new letters amount to about a hundred and seventy: they confirm occasionally what we had already ample evidence of, that Calvin possessed a remarkable repertory of brutal language. In the way of a contribution to history, we do not detect much value in the new matter which M. Bonnet's pious care has disinterred from the congenial dust of the Library at Geneva; and perhaps the fame of the burner of Servetus had been better consulted, had Calvin's encomiasts withheld this additional proof of their hero's disregard of decency, and proficiency in the vulgar tongue. We pluck, quite at random, a florilegium of Christian and evangelical exhortation: 'Ceste malheureuse beste Orry,' vol. i. p. 373. 'Nous faisons trop d'honneur à ces bestes 'connues de les appeler évesques . . . . ce brigant qui a occupé le siége 'de Dieu,' *ibid.* p. 353. 'Ceste beste sauvaige,' vol. ii. p. 16. 'Ceste 'beste venimeuse,' *ibid.* p. 19. We find that it is by no fault of the gentle Calvin that Servetus and Gentilis had not many companions at the stake and on the scaffold. Writing to a lady, Madame de Cany, we find Calvin expressing the following amiable regrets with respect to an earlier victim: 'Je vous asseure, Madame, s'il ne fust si tost eschappé, que, pour m'ac-'quitter de mon debvoir, il n'eust pas tenu à moy qu'il ne fust passé par 'le feu.' Vol. i. p. 336. The present Editor may well express his curiosity about the person who evoked, to use his own euphemistic language, 'Ces 'paroles empreintes de l'âpre rigueur du réformateur?' John Calvin, however, has his consolations: he thinks that the God of mercy will accept the will for the deed. He and his pleasant lady correspondent find a pious hope in the belief, 'Toutesfois si le bien que nous taschons de faire 'n'adresse comme il seroit à désirer, c'est bien asses que Dieu accepte 'nostre service,' *ibid.* At vol. i. p. 69, note, we find M. Bonnet repeating Beza's foolish fanfaronade of Calvin's volunteering his services to attend the plague patients in 1542. Mr. Dyer, in his recent 'Life of Calvin,' has proved incontestably that Calvin, in common with the whole body of ministers, exhibited the greatest reluctance to attend the hospital and visit the sick; and it was on this occasion, although Calvin had contrived to get a vote from the council keeping him at home, because he was wanted to serve in the church, that the ministers 'refused to repair to the hospital, 'and said they would rather go to the devil.' On this occasion, 'Calvin

Digitized by Google

'and his brother ministers appearing before the council on the subject, 'were dismissed with the significant resolution, "Resolved: To pray to 'God to give the ministers more constancy in future."' At vol. ii. p. 461, we find a curious letter of reproof to a certain minister, Desprès, who had celebrated a marriage between a man and his deceased wife's sister: Calvin remarks, 'Quant au fait en soi, Luther estoit encores assez novice et mal 'exercé en l'Escriture, quand il fait le sermon que vous alléguez. Nous 'avons esté esbahis de l'annotation qu'on a mise sur le 18 du Lévitique.'

We have received from Mr. Van Voorst what we presume is a reissue of his famous edition of the 'Vicar of Wakefield,' with Mulready's illustrations. Many gift-books have appeared since this publication; but taking into account both the especial suitableness of this the most popular fiction in the English language, the powers of the illustrator, combining both delicacy of touch and poetry of conception, and the dignity as well as grace with which the wood has been cut by Mr. Thompson, we think that on the whole the volume may be taken as a model of English attainments, literary and artistic. Mulready's illustrations recall Hogarth's suggestive fulness without his coarseness, and, what is rare in art, they show that the grotesque need not degenerate into caricature. In their truthfulness of conception and honest scrupulous execution, every line cut as sharply as in an etching, the woodcuts are little short of perfection.

In 'A Guide to the Parish Church,' (Deighton & Bell,) by Mr. Harvey Goodwin, many things are agreeably and characteristically talked over, and persuasively enough recommended. The day *ought* to be past, indeed, and in many quarters is so, for dwelling on divers of the points here discussed at large. The book, in fact, is much in the old-fashioned style of Stanley's 'Faith of a Church-of-England-man.' Is it quite so faithful as books of that date were, to the highest and truest aspects of Christian doctrine? Mr. Goodwin, in his definition of a priest, omits his characteristic and determinative,—the power, viz. of consecrating the Eucharist. In critical points like this, he is always just short enough of the truth to be sure to be popular. In all other respects he well deserves to be so.

Mr. Wigan Harvey, in his two volumes 'On the Creeds,' (J. W. Parker,) has done something more than reproduced the labours of Pearson. The treatise is independent, and in many respects is eminently suited for theological students, who are often deterred from Pearson by the ruggedness of his style. In his theology the present writer is decidedly orthodox; and his Hebrew and Syriac acquirements invest some of his commentaries with unusual interest. The Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds are treated in a combined discussion: the Athanasian Creed receives a separate discussion. Here Mr. Harvey proposes, with sufficient modesty, to assign an earlier origin to this illustrious confession than that assigned to it by Waterland. Hilary of Arles is deposed in favour of Victricius of Rouen; and Mr. Harvey argues that S. Augustine, in the Treatise *de Trinitate*, illustrates the Creed as an older document, Waterland's argument being that the Creed was rather compiled from the Bishop of Hippo's previous teaching. In this latter view, antecedent to other points of criticism, we are disposed

Digitized by Google

to agree with the present author: it is more probable that a single writer should illustrate a formal and accredited document, rather than that an ecclesiastical symbol should be only a cento from a contemporary, however distinguished, author's works. As to the point of attributing the *Quicunque Vult* to Victricius, we are unable to accompany Mr. Harvey. It is certain that he was accused of heresy, certain also that he cleared himself of the charge. But Paulinus of Nola, the only evidence appealed to by Mr. Harvey, does not say once that Victricius published a confession at all. He merely says, writing to Victricius, 'No doubt you said so and so: 'I feel confident that you agree with me in believing and teaching thus 'and thus.' Paulinus does not even profess to have seen Victricius' confession, and bears no witness even to its existence: all that he does is to suggest certain language for his correspondent's avowal. We think this slender ground for attributing any published Creed to Victricius: to connect him with the (so called) Athanasian symbol there is no documentary evidence whatever. Le Brun, the Paris editor of Paulinus, in a particular dissertation on the Life of Victricius, (Paris, 1685,) gives no intimation whatever that he ever composed a Creed on the occasion of the attacks on his orthodoxy. The question as to the age of the Creed within thirty or forty years is, however, very immaterial. We desire to recommend Mr. Harvey without any hesitation or drawback.

The body of Cambridge writers who are engaged in editing the important series of Ecclesiastical Manuals published by Macmillan, seem to be supplying a need which ought to be recognised by the Universities themselves. It is the *Times* Fund supplementing—as they say—a deficient and ill-arranged commissariat. Mr. Procter's 'History of the Book of Common Prayer' is by far the best commentary extant: somewhat of the credit of this must of course be attributed to the fact that it is the last. It is all but impossible not to improve upon Wheatley with the works of Cardwell, Palmer, Maskell, and Lathbury extant. In availing himself of these sources, Mr. Procter only claims to have epitomized their labours. He has done more. He has harmonized them. Not only do the present illustrations embrace the whole range of original sources indicated by Mr. Palmer, but Mr. Procter compares the present Book of Common Prayer with the Scotch and American Forms; and he frequently sets out in full the Sarum Offices. From the recent Parliamentary paper he gives a full account of the mischief threatened in the abominable suggestions of 1689. It seems an especial indication of a providential care over the future of the English Church, that just as the subject of Liturgical revision or readaptation is presenting itself, our sources of knowledge should be at the same junction so much enlarged. There is not a thoughtful or well-informed Clergyman in England who would not denounce, and be enabled to resist, on intelligent grounds, the sort of haphazard suggestions of twenty years ago. The subject is understood: and as a manual of extensive information, historical and ritual, imbued with sound Church principles, we are entirely satisfied with Mr. Procter's important volume.

Mr. George Hill's pamphlet, 'A Letter to the Rev. Dr. Barrow,' (J. H. Parker,) is intended to show that Queen's College has no right to appoint

Digitized by Google

the Head of S. Edmund's Hall. It is a difficult matter to prove that a power which has been publicly exercised for some three hundred years, of which the grounds disputed were long ago examined, and decided to be unquestionable, is unfounded; and we must say, we think Mr. Hill has failed in his object. He suggests that the Hall should be incorporated, and the Head appointed by a certain number of the members. Of course, if one Hall has this new constitution, all ought to have it; because the Chancellor's power of appointment is, we apprehend, quite as much an encroachment on Aularian rights as that of a College. Whether such a scheme would answer we should think questionable, and its being an interference with vested interests and the claims of property must prove fatal to it. The general tone of Mr. Hill's pamphlet is excellent, though we think his arguments very weak.

'The Cross and the Dragon,' (Smith, Elder & Co.) is, as far as matter goes, a succinct and, as far as we can judge, a trustworthy account of the early attempts to introduce the Gospel into China. On the whole, Mr. Kesson, its author, is fair; but we fail to discover that he has any very distinct religious sympathies. He pronounces all attempts to evangelize China equal failures; and with intrepid impartiality he looks with equal despair both on Jesuits and Tract Societies. To the former he does some justice, especially on the necessity of some sort of compromise with such strange materials. It is painful to find that Church of England missions find no place in the present writer's review; nor do we anticipate much from Bishop Smith's episcopate. Mr. Kesson dismisses with contempt the notion, much cultivated at May meetings, that the revolt in China had a religious, still less a 'Protestant,' purpose. He attributes it only to the secret societies: and it is much more like a Socialist than a religious movement. Does not Mr. Kesson judge of Buddhism in its most unfavourable aspect, when he selects the Siamese and Chinese developments as its typical forms?

A very unpretending tract, by Mr. Philip Freeman, who has transferred his learning and activity from Chichester to Cumbrae, under the title of 'Plain Directions for understanding and using the Morning and Evening Services,' (Edinburgh: Grant,) is really a deep and instructive analysis of the principles implied in the Church's Ritual and Liturgy. It is, we find, and are glad to find, the sketch of a larger and forthcoming treatise on the subject. As sooner or later the revision of, as well as additions to, the extant Services must come before us, Mr. Freeman's labours in showing the deep principles upon which our Offices are constructed are especially well timed.

Reckoning among our readers the Vicaress as well as the Vicar, we desire to introduce with all commendation the work of a lady (S. W.), 'Directions for cutting out and making Articles of Dress,' published by the S.P.C.K. We regret, speaking from our own experience, that needle-work has of late years been too much neglected, and too much mechanically taught, in our national schools. And as we suspect, the visit of the inspector has not a little helped to discourage needle-work. The lady who sends us this little manual has met this necessity of our schools, and

Digitized by Google

we desire to recommend it. Those in our own confidence—better qualified to speak than ourselves on this subject—assure us, and this after experiment, that we can accredit S. W.'s little manual with entire confidence. It is very intelligibly and sensibly written, in which respect it forms an agreeable contrast to the questions and answers in a publication of the same purpose, 'Plain Needle-work,' (Masters,) one of the Finchley Manuals of Industry, which, however, is also a very useful little work.

The war has called out some poets. Mr. Lushington, of whom we spoke last quarter—the Laureate in verse is not equal to his fame—and one or two clerical bards. Mr. R. Milman, one of a poetic race, has printed 'Inkermann, a poem,' (J. H. Parker,) to which we apply Goldsmith's safe formula of criticism,—the author could have done better if he had taken more pains. Some stanzas—the poem is in a ballad form—of absolute meanness, are more than relieved by other lines, which dash on cheerily with the true war tramp. Mr. Milman seems to have tired of his subject towards the conclusion, which is tame.—'Duty, or the Heroes of Balaklava,' (Masters,) is in blank verse. Considering all the painful controversy and other distresses which are connected with Lord Raglan's famous order, sent to Lord Lucan by Capt. Nolan, it would perhaps surprise the military hero to find, on the authority of H. A., the author of 'Duty,' &c. that it ran in these words:—

> 'Knights, to the rescue! Ho! advance, and watch
> Each hostile movement. England looks to you!'

—'Christmas Dawn, 1854,' and 'New Year's Eve, 1855,' (Macmillan,) by H. R. F., also in blank verse: pretty, but not above the average.

Mr. Burgon's 'Century of Verses in Memory of Dr. Routh,' (J. H. Parker,) is of a more artistic character. It recalls, and successfully, Tennyson's more domestic—and many think his happier—style. These lines are most truthful:—

> ..... 'Let me long
> Cherish thy precious mem'ry! long retain
> The image of thy venerable form,
> Stooping beneath its century of years,
> And wrapped in solemn academic robes,
> Cassock, and scarf, and buckles, bands and wig,
> And such a face as none beheld before,
> Save in an ancient frame on college walls,
> And heard of as "the portrait of a great
> And learn'd Divine, who flourish'd years ago."
>
> 'Yet would thy sunken eye shine bright as day
> If haply some one touch'd thy favourite theme,—
> The martyr'd monarch's fortunes and his times:
> Yet brighter, if the mem'ries of thy youth
> Were quicken'd into sudden life; but most
> 'Twas joy to hear thy solemn voice descant
> Of Fathers, Councils, and the page Divine:
> For then thy words were precious and well weighed,

Digitized by Google

Oracular with wisdom. Or if men
And manners were thy theme,—scholars and wits,
The idols of past years,—how rich thy vein!
Thy speech how courteous, classical and kind!
Each story new, because so wondrous old:
And each particular exactly given,
The name, the place, the author, yea, the page—
Nought was forgotten. "But I tire you, Sir."
(So would he say:) "I fear I tire you, Sir?
An old man, Sir!"—while one's heart danced for joy.'

'Arnold's School Classics. Horatii Opera.' We can speak in very favourable terms of this edition. It is well adapted for the use of schools. The text is kept free from all matter to which reasonable objection could be made, and the difficulties occurring in it are fully and clearly explained. The introductions to each ode are much to the purpose; while the notes keep the limit of the immediate want in view, giving all that the student could require for the elucidation of the text, but no more. It is an additional recommendation to the edition, that the notes are placed at the end of the volume.

In 'The Champion, a Course of Lectures on the Temptation,' (Rivingtons,) Mr. George Richards shows that he has taken a great deal of pains with his subject. He seems to have read very largely before he began to write; and there is consequently more fulness and stuff in his sermons than usual. The style is, we think, stilted.

Broken catechisms are the ordinary apology for idleness in the teacher and cause of ignorance in the taught. Mr. C. J. Heathcote's 'It is Written,' (Rivingtons,) however, illustrates the Catechism from Scripture in such a way that it exercises rather than supersedes the intellectual process. It is for its size the fullest manual which we are acquainted with. Mr. Heathcote, we observe, and the practice is usual, grounds his little book on the Sixth Article. But how does this apply to the necessity of receiving the whole of Scripture? The Sixth Article is entirely negative: it tells us what not to believe, and tells us that Holy Scripture contains all that we have to believe: but what we want in these days is a Fortieth Article, announcing not the sufficiency of Holy Scripture, but the necessity of receiving the whole of it. If, as we are often told, the 'continent' of our faith is in the Thirty-nine Articles, it is worth a thought that they say nothing about the inspiration of the Bible.

Mr. Ernest Hawkins has added to his many other services the publication of a very simple and intelligible collection of 'Family Prayers.' (Bell & Daldy.) Its object is to give a devotional manual which has no references or complications in it. Its arrangement is one of continuous reading: and, what we much like, there are prayers and intercessions for special purposes.—'A Manual of Prayers for Working Men,' (from the same author and publishers,) is among the most practical and intelligible which we have seen.

Digitized by Google

Protection has found its bard; one who combines both functions of the *vates*. Prophet and poet and priest, Mr. W. Smith Marriott, Rector of Horsmonden, Kent, contrasts 'The Olden and Modern Times,' (Rivingtons,) in some very vigorous antitheses between sundry 'Cotton Lords,' who are the reverend gentleman's abomination, and the

'Olden time,
Ere mad reform deform'd the clime.'

Here are his views of railway travelling:—

'But then for trav'ling!—How reject
The wondrous *march of intellect!*
I grant its speed—but where the view,
If lovely scenes you *whistle* through?
Green, red and blue—their colours ope,
And mix, as in Kaleidoscope.
I grant its speed—for, scarce begun,
Your journey seems well nigh half done;
And ah! too oft, *life's* journey too!
You race the birds—and *I' crus flew?*
Now for the Church!'—P. 12.

which we cannot find room for: and now for something else, 'A Tribute to Dorset,' p. 47:—

'Few counties can with Dorset vie
In ancient aristocracy.
Her yeomen are an honest race;
Oh! may they ever know their place!
Ne'er strive to ape their betters, who
Despise their claims whene'er they do.
Ye Yeomen! if ye would be wise,
Seek not for foreign luxuries,
Stick to your DOUBLE DORSET BEER,
And all the world ye need not fear.'

The poet seems to practise what he preaches; for in presenting us with 'A Song sung at the Stanhope Festival, at Maidstone, in 1850,' in which, speaking of poor Lord Stanhope, we are told that

'He loves his country, and he thinks 'tis honest at the core,
Though there is something rotten in't which makes him very sore.
The *Peel* is very bad indeed, so bad, that o'er and o'er,
He says, when *off*, he wishes ne'er to hear it mention'd more,
Like a fine old English nobleman,' &c. &c.—P. 105.

Mr. Smith Marriott goes on to inform us 'that he was to have presided on this occasion; but though prevented, he had the pleasure of *indicting* the memorial.'—P. 106. This is not the only indictment with which Mr. Smith Marriott ought to be connected: common sense and common decency have a heavy charge against him.

Mr. Alfred Barrett's 'Little Arthur's Latin Primer,' (Longman,) strikes us as both sensible and really useful. A teacher who tells us that 'it is 'much better to begin with lessons which inspire the pupil with the idea

Digitized by Google

'that he is above rather than below his work,' and who goes on to say that 'want of confidence in a pupil will terminate in want of power,' is to be trusted.—Mr. Barrett's 'Latin Exercises for the Lowest Form' is a supplementary school-book, and will be found useful in quarters where we are glad to think that the study of Latin—chiefly as a medium of learning universal grammar—is spreading: we mean, in the girls' school-room.

'Historic Notes on the Books of the Old and New Testaments,' by Samuel Sharpe, (Moxon,) ought to be labelled, Infidelity for the Use of Schools. In his Preface, the writer observes that he 'avoids the difficult subjects of the inspiration, miracles, prophecies of a Messiah, &c.' One can hardly understand how a subject is avoided by its existence being denied and argued against: for example, the subject of inspiration is scarcely 'avoided,' when it is quietly pronounced that much of the Pentateuch is of the age of Josiah.

'Nicholas Ferrar. Two Lives, by his brother John and by Doctor Jebb,' (Macmillan,) is the first instalment of a series of illustrated biographies, styled 'Cambridge in the Nineteenth Century.' This is an undertaking of large promise; and judging from the first specimen, the promise will be worthily fulfilled. Mr. Mayor is a very accomplished editor: he exhibits immense research, and in the monograph of Ferrar he presents us with the life of a most remarkable person, which has often been told, but never so fully or with such entire sympathy. No minute particular escapes Mr. Mayor's research: it is critical as well as historical; and it quite supersedes Dr. Peckard, Dr. Wordsworth, and Mr. Macdonogh, to say nothing of a better work, Sir George Wheler's 'Protestant Monastery.' Ferrar being dead yet speaketh: and if Gidding Church now reflects the image of days which have thrown a saintly halo around it, and if the estate once more presents a smiling contrast to the neighbouring parishes, all is owing to the impression made on the boyish sympathies of Mr. Hopkinson, the present proprietor, some sixty years ago, by a perusal of Ferrar's Life. The friend of Herbert and Crashaw, the host of King Charles, and one who left behind him such personal witnesses of his holy life as Bishop Williams, Jackson, Bishop Cosin, and Oley, Fuller and Walton, may well leave a memory which it is a singular discredit to Mr. Carlyle to have been almost the only modern to disparage. We may add that the volume is beautifully printed; and it only wants some pictorial illustrations of Gidding and a portrait to make it complete.

'An Inquiry by the light of Scripture into the doctrine of our Lord's Presence in the Holy Communion,' (Rivingtons,) denies 'that there is a 'real though invisible presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the 'Holy Eucharist under the form of bread and wine,' p. 8, and expressly argues 'that our Lord's words cannot be understood in any other than a figurative sense.'—P. 4. To support this view, it is significant enough that the writer is obliged to misquote and falsify the Church's doctrine on the subject. He says, p. 8, 'The Church of England holds that Christ's 'Body and Blood are in heaven, and cannot be in more than one place at 'a time.' The Church of England says no such thing; but does say 'the

Digitized by Google

natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here;' but says nothing of the sort of the spiritual or glorified Body.

A vigorous and closely argued 'Apology for Secular Recreations,' (Rivingtons,) appears in the form of a pungent letter to Mr. Close, of Cheltenham. Argument and wit are thrown away in this quarter. It was, we think, Fénelon who put the whole subject in the clearest way. 'You 'and I, my good friend,' said he to the puritanical, though Papist, *curé*, 'are not called upon to dance on Sunday afternoon; but the rule for us is 'not the rule for your poor labourers.' And so is it with the secular denouncers of balls and cricket-matches. They aim at a consistent logic, of which the inconsistency is the most glaring, because if really carried out it would compel its advocates one and all to bitter herbs and sackcloth; and would not only forbid all recreation, but every other life than that of an Egyptian anchoret. The present writer puts this with great point; and writing from Cheltenham, carries the war into the enemy's country. 'Let me tell you, and the young ladies who follow you, that if they think 'they are safe from vanity and envy because they do not go to balls, and 'that no pursuits can engross or intoxicate the intellect except reading 'novels and plays, they are most fatally mistaken.'—P. 24.

'The Recent Decree on the Immaculate Conception, &c.; a Sign of the Times,' (Bosworth,) is an 'Irvingite' sermon, 'preached at Albury,' of considerable power. It argues that the decree trenches upon the right belief in the Incarnation. 'If,' says the preacher, 'the Virgin Mary was 'conceived and born without original sin, then Christ did not take upon 'Him the seed of Abraham; his flesh was not part of our fallen nature, and 'we were not redeemed by Him.' In a sense this objection has its value; but there are indications throughout the sermon that the body whose opinions it must represent have not yet worked themselves free from the heresy of him by whose name they are known. Edward Irving held the doctrine of the peccability of our Lord's human nature; and the following passage from this sermon is important:—'It is now more than twenty 'years since a controversy, substantially the same with that which is now 'raised, was brought forward on a different platform and amongst the 'members of other communions than that where it is now discussed. 'Many that are still living remember how great a conflict took place when 'the practical consequences of our Lord's Incarnation were opened and 'set forth by one who has long since fallen asleep in Christ, and who, with 'whatever alloy of imperfection it may have been accompanied, yet bore a 'mighty witness to this fundamental truth.' Is this an avowal, or disavowal, of Irving's specific doctrine?

In almost all the observations and criticisms to which the recent Report on Church Services, presented to Convocation, has given occasion, we observe, and with thankfulness, a sober and reverential spirit. A pamphlet, under the title, 'What is Convocation going to do for our Church Services? By a Fellow of a College,' (Oxford: Vincent,) is characterized by the feeling. It deserves reading, not so much for its practical suggestions, which are not many, as for its tone.

Digitized by Google

The cheap and useful edition of Hume and Smollett, with Hughes' Continuation, published by Bell & Daldy of Fleet Street, goes on regularly. After all, and acknowledging all its defects, Hume maintains a ground which he did something to win.

Mr. Oldknow's 'A Month in Portugal' deserves to take rank with Mr. Meyrick's work on Spain. It is, however, more graphic and ecclesiological; and contains some curious verses by his fellow-traveller, Mr. Neale.

Such as think the Archbishop of Dublin the Bacon or Selden of the day, will welcome a volume, and another is promised, of 'Detached Thoughts and Apophthegms of Archbishop Whately.' (Blackader.) We do not think so, and therefore we do not treat this collection as of especial value: but that it contains a number of smart and ingenious things cleverly put, there can be no question. A sayer of good sayings, however, if wise, has the greatest reason to complain of this fragmentary exhibition of himself. Few of us would like to be judged by our knuckles, or by a lock of hair.

On the observance of the Sunday question, we have several publications. 1. Abbé Mullois' 'Sunday of the People in France,' translated. (Masters.) A remarkable movement, to which we have already called attention, is going on in Paris, headed by the Clergy, for the better observance of Sunday. —2. 'The Present State of the movement for the Suppression of unnecessary Sunday Trading in London,' (Rivingtons,) is a sequel, and an important one, to a previous publication, 'The Extent, Evils, and Needlessness of Sunday Trading.'—3. 'The Crystal Palace: Reasons for and against the Admission of the Public on Sundays.' (J. H. Parker.) All these publications, the last least so, keep entirely clear of the Sabbatarian view of the Lord's death. We can therefore go with them entirely. What makes us so often hesitate about petitions on this subject is the unfortunate argument which, as many of our readers will remember, and, as the subject increases in importance, all ought to remember, extorted from Thordike the memorable words:—

'The second monstrous imposture is, that the first day of the week, 'called Sunday, is the Sabbath by the force of the Fourth Commandment: 'a mistake so gross, that it may well serve for an instance, what faction 'can do with men that are otherwise sober. That God, by commanding 'the Jews to keep the seventh day of the week, to wit, that day on which 'He ended the creation of the world, and for that very reason commanding 'it, should be thought to command Christians to keep the first day of the 'week, on which He began the creation, and our Lord Jesus Christ arose 'from the dead; that is, that the same words of the same commandment in 'writing should oblige Jews to rest on the Saturday, which oblige Chris-'tians to rest on the Sunday, is a thing which, when this fit of frenzy shall 'be past us, will scarce be believed that ever any man would believe. True 'it is this first day hath been observed in and ever since the Apostles' 'time; but not by virtue of that law, which their office was to declare 'expired and out of date; but by the act of their own authority, whereby 'they gave laws to Christ's Church.'—*Thorndike, Letter concerning Religion*, § 17. *Works*, vol. v. p. 17. Compare also, Due Way of composing Dif-

Digitized by Google

ferences, § 39. Epilogue, book i. c. xxi. §§ 10—13. Laws of the Church, book iii. c. xxi. § 2. Just Weights and Measures, c. xxiii. § 6.

Mr. R. I. Wilberforce, it seems, has a follower. A pamphlet has appeared, which, excepting its name, (with which we do not charge Mr. Wilberforce,) is little else than a *rechauffé* of his 'Principles of Church Authority.' It is called 'One more Return from Captivity,' written by the Rev. E. S. Foulkes, a late Fellow of Jesus College. We hope, for his sake, that *Return* is a misprint for *Returned;* for that one gentleman should consider himself sufficient to constitute *a return* in his own person, would savour as little of humility as the rest of the title does of sobriety of thought. The greater part of the pamphlet consists of quotations from Mr. Wilberforce, and approval of his sentiments. But Mr. Foulkes is not unacquainted with Ecclesiastical History, and he seems to have found considerable discrepancy between Ecclesiastical History and Mr. Wilberforce's representations of Ecclesiastical History. Accordingly he asks, in a puzzled way, in page 2, 'Can truth be served by distorting facts?' *We* think not, but, according to Mr. Foulkes' showing, Mr. Wilberforce thinks otherwise; for the former points out that the latter has 'distorted facts' relating to the Council of Sardica, the Council of Ephesus, the Council of Chalcedon, and in respect to the 'Imperial Edicts,' which, 'without doubt, 'enforced the jurisdiction of the Roman See much more effectually than 'the Sardican Canons.'—P. 6. He says, too, truly enough, that 'to hide 'one side of history from view is surely to represent the other unfairly;' and proceeds to point out that Mr. Wilberforce has 'hidden one side of history from view,' in respect to the Second and Third Councils of Constantinople, and with regard to 'the spurious donations of the emperors,' &c. There are, however, other 'distortions of fact,' (p. 20,) and 'concealments of one side of history,' (p. 10,) to which he yields a placid acquiescence; and it would seem that he will not probably long continue to ask uncomfortable questions of this sort, for he has adopted the principle on which history is falsified on 'religious' grounds. Here it is: 'I had 'traced the historical development of the Papal supremacy over and over 'again laboriously, but it had never before struck me, that *whether or not it* '*could be proved from history*, it was stamped with the living assent of the 'Universal Church.'—P. 22. Let that principle sink in deeply enough, and Mr. Foulkes' next history (he proclaims himself on his title-page as the author of a Manual) may be as true as M. Rohrbacher's. In p. 35, we find that Mr. Foulkes has been made to take a fearful oath that he will never rejoin the Anglican Church, and to pray before God and the Holy Gospels that he may be damned eternally, if he ever allows 'arguments' to convince him to do so. Those who required him thus to bind his soul with a curse, must have had very little confidence, either in his stedfastness and strength of mind, or in the inherent goodness of their cause, when they thus thought it necessary to guard against the possible and legitimate effects of 'arguments.' 'Should it ever happen,' he was made to say, '(which God forbid) that I should, for any pretext or argument's sake, 'separate myself from this unity, and incur the crime of perjury, may 'I fall under the sentence of eternal condemnation, and have my portion

Digitized by Google

'with the author of schism in the next world! So help me God and these 'His Holy Gospels!' Mr. Foulkes tells us (p. iv.) that he 'contemplates travelling upon a large scale.' We recommend him to go in quest of the Ææan Island, and when he has reached it, to dig for the herb Moly. It may be that, if he dares to walk through the windy mountain-tops of thought (δι' ἄκριας ἠνεμοέσσας), the golden-rodded god of speech may vouchsafe even yet to meet him, and point out where it grows.

A little monthly serial, under the title of the 'Old Church Porch,' deserves notice for a course of valuable papers, in which a most respected and competent writer is refuting the claims of Irvingism. We may express a hope that, when this series has been finished, the subject of Mormonism may be treated by the same pen in an equally simple but convincing manner..

Among the very best, perhaps the very best, Bible prints, is a German series in wood-cuts by Schnorr, 'Bibel in Bildern.' They are of a high and dignified school, roughly but not coarsely cut in wood, with the power but not the mannerism of what is known as German art. They tell more than Overbeck's over-refined conceptions, and are frequently as suggestive as Reztsch. Above all, they are very cheap, and for family purposes, not for cottage walls, we know of no successful rivals. They may be had of Williams & Norgate, the English agents.

One of the prettiest as well as most learned and interesting architectural publications which it has been our good fortune for a long time to see, is now in the course of publication in Paris. We refer to the 'Dictionnaire Raisonné of the Architecture of France,' (Bance,) from the eleventh to the sixteenth century, from the pen and the pencil of that accomplished mediæval architect, M. Viollet le Duc, which is appearing in numbers. As might have been supposed, from the antecedent reputation of the writer, the ecclesiastical department is the most fully treated. Nevertheless, the military architecture of the middle ages is copiously illustrated with a multiplicity of wood-cuts, exhibiting M. Viollet le Duc's peculiar felicity of drawing. The law of the ground-plans of cathedral and collegiate churches is considered under the double aspect of architecture and of ecclesiology, properly so called, while the head '*autel*,' comprising some exquisite illustrations from S. Denis, the Ste. Chapelle, &c. &c., lays down the remarkable fact, that until the period of the Renaissance, altars were never made merely constructional adjuncts, but always preserved the use of a table conjointly.

'Convocation: Remarks on the Bishop of Oxford's Charge.' (Rivingtons.) This is a pamphlet by Dr. Maitland.—'Church Questions: A Letter to a Friend.' (Hatchard.) This is an anonymous pamphlet. Besides the names of their respective publishers, these two little publications fit into each other both by way of contrast and complement. Dr. Maitland is high, and certainly not dry: 'the Writer,' as he signs himself, is as dry as the Zaharab, and as flat. Each of them is decidedly opposed to the revival of Convocation. Dr. Maitland questions 'the existence of any individual who maintains the perfection of our present

Digitized by Google

'system,' p. 29, and yet declines to introduce formal and authoritative reforms into it. Mr. Hatchard's anonymous scribe, as he sonorously expresses it, 'feels that he is only assuming a fact almost universally 'acknowledged, when he regards that specific organization of our common 'Christianity, which has been happily and authoritatively established in 'this country, as more extensive in its action, as potentially more influential for good, as commanding larger resources, material, substantial and 'moral, than any other system, indeed than all the other systems of 'religious machinery in existence."—P. 3. Dr. Maitland will not hear of Convocation attempting the remedy of the Church's grievances, because with a sarcastic complaisance he reminds the Bishop of Oxford that an active Bishop can do everything that the Church wants in the way of extension. The author of 'Church Questions' will let well alone for the very opposite reason; not because the Bishops do so much, but because happily they have nothing to do: 'it appears to me that the duties of 'a Bishop, though in the highest degree solemn and important, are not 'very numerous.' Still each writer makes an exception in favour of his own favourite scheme, or selects his own especial grievance. The letter-writer proposes the sale of the Chancellor's livings: and Dr. Maitland selects 'dilapidations' as one of the two most pressing evils of the Church. We had forgotten. The letter-writer, being, as internal evidence suggests, an incumbent of serene temper and plump proportions, in person and preferment, thinks that the only 'Clergy Discipline Bill' which is wanted, is one which shall compel the Bishop of Exeter to ordain and license certain individuals of the letter-writer's principles. 'Among the questions which 'would fall within the province of such a court [*i.e.* a court for criminous 'Bishops] would obviously be that of reviewing the ground on which a Bishop might refuse ordination to a candidate, or a licence to a curate; not that of 'incompetency, irregularity, or manifest unsoundness in the recognised 'faith of the Church—on such matters the Bishop must have a discretionary power—but that of a difference of opinion on questions which 'either the Church has left open, or has decided, through its legal tribunals, 'in favour of the appellant. It is but little relevant to the question to say 'that it is not to be supposed that a Bishop can act in a manner to demand 'such interposition, when it is a fact of more than single occurrence that 'the Church must have been deprived of the services of men of devoted 'piety and unimpeachable excellence, if through the wisdom—the *mitis* '*sapientia*—of a superior prelate, the door had not been opened, which had 'been closed through the wilful pervicacity of an inferior. It is to the 'honour of the generally revered prelacy of our Church, and no feeble 'testimony to the discretion usually employed in their appointment, 'that there have been comparatively few who could have been justly 'obnoxious to such a tribunal.'—Pp. 14, 15. Dr. Maitland, with an oversight most extraordinary in one of his sagacity, taunts the Bishop of Oxford with calling attention to the law of clerical discipline as one of the matters requiring the immediate attention of Convocation, because it is a subject on which 'there is not, as far as he knows, much 'strong feeling in the Church;' and then goes to wonder that 'in these '*agenda* we are not met with the question of the Real Presence ....

Digitized by Google

'the Gorham case or the Denison case or the Maurice case, not a hint of 'any attempt to stem the current of blasphemy, or the least suggestion of 'any opposition to any form or shape of false doctrine, heresy, or schism; 'no, but Convocation is to sit down in the midst of these *neglecta incendia* to 'discuss . . . . the discipline of criminous clerks.'—P. 24. Has it not occurred to Dr. Maitland that one, and a most important, subject of clerical discipline, is the faith of the clergy, and that any measure of clerical discipline, and any attempt to construct a court of appeal, must in the very first rank place questions of doctrine? *In limine* Dr. Maitland attempts to fasten an error in logic on the Bishop of Oxford. The Bishop had said in his charge, 'The revival of Convocation is spoken of as a party 'movement, to which we must answer, that this is only so far true, 'as that it is the movement of *that party* which believes in the Church's 'life, and seeks for its perfection,' (p. 6,) 'for amongst its adherents 'are to be found the names of men such as Mr. Kempthorne, identi- 'fied with the Evangelical party.' On this Dr. Maitland asks, how the fact of the revival of Convocation being advocated by men of both parties 'can be made to prove that those who wrote in that advocacy 'form an exclusive party, characterised by its believing in 'the Church's 'life?' which is precisely the inference which the Bishop did not draw. He argues:—'We are called a party; this I deny. We are no party: 'we only consist of men of all parties, who believe in the Church's life: 'evangelicals and orthodox alike have argued for the revival of Con- 'vocation. Their common feature was that they believed in the Church's 'life.' The Bishop does not say that the Convocationists exhaust the class of those who believe in the Church's life; he does not say, what Dr. Maitland wishes him to say, that they who oppose the revival of Convocation do not believe in the Church's life: he only says that they who advocate it do believe in it. Dr. Maitland says,—'Here is a plain line of demar- 'cation.' How so? I drive none but bay horses: is this equivalent to saying, Everybody else's horses are grey? Dr. Maitland goes on to meet the Bishop's reply to the argument 'that councils are mischievous, be- 'cause ecclesiastical history proves that they have ever ministered to strife,' by saying that 'he does not know who made the objection.' We answer: Dr. M'Caul, among others. Dr. Maitland then proceeds, with that pleasant, brilliant, and airy tone which is so characteristic of him, to criticise the Bishop's Charge, and to suggest that either Convocation is to be a very great, and, therefore, mischievous thing, or a mere mockery and a sham. It occurs to us to confront Dr. Maitland himself with the same sort of teazing ingenuity. He also suggests a long list of *gravamina*—they are Mr. Kempthorne's—on patronage, discipline, the revision of the Prayer Book, false doctrines, clerical education, internal union, comprehension of Dissenters, and the rest, pp. 14, 15. And then Dr. Maitland proceeds to say,—'Is your Convocation going to take up all these subjects, or not? If 'so, when and how? and how is all this secret purpose connected with your 'thin edge of the wedge?—your "adaptation of services," and your '"criminous clerks bill?"' To which we answer—What is your opinion, Dr. Maitland, on all these subjects? You are prudently silent: you reserve the question. You also specify 'dilapidations' as a serious and imminent

Digitized by Google

evil: what is your opinion about discipline, and patronage, and false doctrine? It seems that if the Convocationists have a *doctrina arcani*, we may ask Dr. Maitland if he has no reserved *gravamina*, or whether he is making a clean breast of it by specifying 'dilapidations' as the sin of the Church? Let him declare his sentiments on all these points, and we are ready with our answers. We have a right to ask a censor who charges us with hypocrisy and rancour, and double dealing, to be plain-spoken himself. We say, then, is Mr. Kempthorne's list of grievances a real one? If so, how does Dr. Maitland propose to deal with them? Does he think that under the present system of things a remedy is likely to present itself? If not, what else? The Bishop of Oxford has suggested Convocation; Dr. Maitland will have none of it. What will he have? For ourselves we must say that the merely critical, destructive, contradictory, negative method of dealing with Church difficulties, such as Dr. Maitland has pursued in this—like all his publications—very clever pamphlet, is little likely to attract the sympathy of any party in the Church, except that disreputable one with which it would be a libel to associate Dr. Maitland.

On the Marriage Question, we have received, since our own article was in type, a pamphlet by Mr. F. Newman Rogers, 'An Attempt to discover the true Scriptural Argument in the question of Marriage with a Wife's Sister.' (Rivingtons.) Mr. Rogers is by no means in accord with our own arguments: he will not endure the least submission to the alleged testimony of the Church: and with reference to the passages in Leviticus, he decides, somewhat peremptorily, 'that the appeal to such passages on the side of prohibition is worse than useless.'—P. 8. But after all, Mr. Rogers is very strongly opposed to the relaxation; and this on Scriptural grounds. We attach much value to his argument; because after he surrenders much more than we are disposed to relinquish, he comes to our own conclusion. He brings the case down to its simplest elements: and here he finds enough, and more than enough, on which to protest against any change. A witness of this sort has a peculiar value. He argues that the Jewish law is silent on the question, and that because it does not prescribe, it does tacitly forbid such unions. From its particular point of view, Mr. Rogers' pamphlet has a special value and interest.—We may here add that it will probably become the immediate duty of the Clergy to bring this subject before their parishes and flocks. We must certainly meet our opponents in Parliament by their own weapons: and petitions against the relaxation, that is, against Mr. Heywood's Bill, now in the House of Commons, ought to be sent in without delay. It is to be hoped that the Clergy will be on their guard against the very coarse and palpable bait which is offered in the clause relieving them from any 'action, suit, censure, or punishment,' for refusing to celebrate the proposed marriages. Scotland has already won, by the boldness of its language, the defeat of the measure as far as it is concerned: it will be the fault of the Church of England if the same energy is not displayed by our Clergy on behalf of the purity and sanctity of the domestic and social institutions of our own country.

We cannot do so much justice to Mr. Conington's able 'Inaugural Lecture,' (J. W. Parker,) delivered by him on assuming the chair of the new Latin Professorship in Oxford, as by presenting a specimen of it:—

Digitized by Google

'Those who are accustomed to a careful study of the classics, will see 'that I have by no means exhausted all that could fairly be said on these 'lines, [the first four lines of the Æneid;] in other words, all that is 'required for a complete appreciation of them, at the same time that I have 'been careful not to make them mere pegs on which to hang irrelevant 'questions in philology or æsthetics. Yet, surely the amount of education 'which such a study pre-supposes or imparts is very considerable. In 'considering his author's general character in itself, or in contrast with 'that of another, the student is led to take broad views of rhetorical or 'poetical art; in analysing particular expressions, and disclosing the 'images which they involve, he is made to trace that art in its details. He 'has to skirt the undefined bounds which separate rhetoric from grammar, 'and ascertain the conditions under which words, grammatically appro-'priated to one conception, can be put for those denoting another. He is 'frequently called to investigate grammar itself, by the occurrence of con-'structions which have to be explained by some general law, or left unex-'plained under the shelter of some unquestionable idiom. At other times, he 'will have recourse to comparative philology to illustrate a word or usage 'of the true nature of which the writer himself, learned as he may have 'been in the antiquities of his country's language, had but a dim confused 'consciousness. The casual allusions scattered through the work will 'familiarize him with much historical knowledge; the subject of the work, 'even though it may have no direct bearing on history, with much also. 'This enumeration is a very imperfect one, even as compared with my own 'conception and experience; yet it will be seen that it includes many of 'the elements which are usually held to constitute a general cultivation, 'thus ensuring a discipline of the various parts of the mind, more com-'prehensive, probably, than can be afforded by any other single subject of 'knowledge. But this is not all. These several lines of thought and 'research are not followed for themselves, but as means to something fur-'ther; they make up the method by which the truth of the writer's mean-'ing is to be attained. However great their heterogeneity in relation to 'each other, in this point they all converge. It is difficult to secure any-'thing like completeness in the method, as no man can hope to realize all the 'aspects in which a word or conception has appeared to the mind of an-'other, especially when separated from him by a gulf of centuries; it is 'seldom that we can expect to make the best even of our incompleteness, 'as in any single track of investigation we are liable to meet with failure, 'or at any rate, with only partial success. Such defects, however, do not 'destroy the value of the results which *can* be obtained; and it only requires 'a careful use of the various means in our power to convince us that the 'method of interpretation is one that really deserves the name, leading not 'to specious plausibilities, but to substantial truths. I know not how it may 'be in the case of other sciences, but I can testify to the genuine intellectual 'satisfaction which the mind receives when some discovery, in itself, per-'haps, of quite minor importance, a latent metaphor, a concealed imitation, 'the substitution of one insignificant word or inflexion of a word for another, 'or even the mere position of a word, hitherto overlooked, and now noticed 'accidentally, has flashed light on an entire passage, and a vague sense of 'disproportion has given place to a clear perception of harmonious sym-

Digitized by Google

'metry. Or again, where the lighting up has been not sudden, but gradual, 'it is not the less reassuring to recal the first aspect of a sentence, seem-'ingly complete in itself, and sufficient to the eye of the ordinary reader, and 'compare it with the full appreciation which is gained at last, when every 'point has been accurately scrutinized, and the student once more comes 'to survey it as a whole. Thus the exegetical study of the classics, as it 'appears to me, fulfils the two great conditions of an educational instru-'ment; it gives at once a general and a special discipline; it encourages 'exuberant variety of interest along with severe precision of aim. I do 'not say that it has always had this effect on the mind of the student, but 'I believe that where it has failed to do so, the fault has not been in the 'method, and that if even really great scholars have sometimes been nar-'row and one-sided, they have been so far less complete, not only as men, 'but as scholars. I believe also that, like all methods, it has a salutary 'tendency to equalize human capacities, so that though the greatest reward 'will always fall to his lot who, having the greatest natural powers, econo-'mises them most prudently, and disposes them to the best advantage, 'there will yet be an abundant harvest which inferior minds are certain to 'reap, by the mere fact of their honest compliance with prescribed rules; 'while those who go out in their own strength, disdaining all labour that 'appears uncongenial, find for the most part barrenness and comparative 'scarcity.'

Mr. C. J. Ellicott, in his edition of the 'Epistle to the Galatians,' (J. W. Parker,) has done very much to retrieve the character of English scholarship. It consists of a literal and grammatical commentary, together with a revised translation. We must pronounce it to be a work of a very high order, of sound learning, extensive research, and excellent principles. Mr. Ellicott has availed himself much more than his predecessors or contemporaries have done of continental researches: less adequately, we think, of patristic literature, especially of S. Augustine. The revised translation we are not asked, we suppose, to receive under any other form than that of an indirect commentary. In this aspect it has great value, as presenting an exegetical whole, in which the argument may stand out clearly; otherwise we should demur at some of the phraseology, which has, we think, too modern an aspect. *Ex. grat.* in enumerating the works of the Spirit, v. 20, Mr. Ellicott translates ἐριθεῖαι, 'caballings:' this may be a fair illustration, but the political and very recent origin of the word, a mere anagram, makes it admirably unsuitable as a translation of Scripture: αἱρέσεις is translated, and we think inadequately, in the same passage 'factions.'

Bishop Ken's 'Exposition of the Creed,' and his 'Approach to the Holy Altar,' have been beautifully reprinted in sumptuous type and published by Mr. Murray. They appear to be the labour of love of one whose 'Life of Ken' the author has illustrated both in practice and in editorial care.

Mr. F. Trench's 'Lecture delivered at Reading, on Conversation,' (J. W. Parker,) is a pleasant little brochure. The writer means to be reverent, and is to our mind much the reverse, when, by way of a 'tag' to his dis-

Digitized by Google

cussion, one ranging over social relations exclusively, he refers to our Lord's conversations—which were simple revelations, from the most sacred source—with Nicodemus and the Samaritan woman.

Mr. John David Chambers, in his republication of Thorndike's 'Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist,' (Masters,) has done a permanent service to the Church. Directly, the publication has only a temporary value, in relation to Archdeacon Denison's late case; but the body of notes which Mr. Chambers has selected and arranged, has a permanent and technical importance. So skilfully is the catena set out, that it becomes a conspectus of Anglican doctrine on the subject; and, as such, we thank the compiler for it,—thanks not the less sincere because he has made a stumble, at starting, in speaking, in his preface, of Sir George Wheler and William Law as laymen.—Of considerable value, also, is a catena of authorities on the same subject, published by J. H. Parker, 'The Doctrine of the Real Presence, Part I.,' which it is known was drawn up by Dr. Wright. It is curious, as containing extracts from an extraordinary and forgotten poem—Dr. Beaumont's 'Psyche.'—Mr. Grueber's excellent analysis of the Twenty-ninth Article, which we spoke of in our last number, has been published in pamphlet form by Masters.

'The First Five Years of the House of Mercy, Clewer,' by Mr. T. T. Carter, (Masters,) is a sign of the times. It shows what earnest patience may do, and it displays the blessing attendant on the day of small things. Here is a work now coincident with the Church of England, spreading on all sides, accepted on all hands, of the plainest necessity, yet from its nature difficult and even dangerous: a neglected duty, entirely neglected, yet, as it seems, entirely retrieved. And why should not this be an omen of future successes in other directions? That we have had any share in this good work, is one of the very few consolations attendant upon our duties as a public organ.

Mr. Arthur Stanley's 'Historical Memorials of Canterbury,' (Murray;) four essays on, 1. the Landing of S. Augustine; 2. the Murder of Becket; 3. Edward the Black Prince; and 4. Becket's Shrine, make a very interesting volume. Some of the Essays have been published before; altogether they exhibit an unusually attractive specimen of a sympathizing criticism, combined with original and conscientious research.

Mr. Charles Marriott's Sermon, 'The Unity of the Spirit,' (Masson,) preached for the Patriotic Fund, deserves special commendation.—Mr. Harvey's 'Suspense,' (Groombridge,) preached at Hornsey, is in a nice tone.

'Elements of a Plan for the Liquidation of the Public Debt.' (Longman.) These Essays, the first of which was published in the year 1819, were written with the sole view of harmonizing daily life with the precepts of the Gospel, by poising the political action of society on the basis of justice. Some of them have appeared in a curious work, called 'Postulates and Data.' The demonstration attempted throughout is, the dependence of the

Digitized by Google

individual, whatever may be his social condition, upon the due consideration of the rights and position of his neighbour, and the well-being of the body politic upon sound civilization; and that each and all must have a direct regard to the dictates of truth and justice, or the law of righteousness will not be fulfilled. Such has been the impelling motive to intense thought and severe application on the author's part during the progress of a life now extended to eighty years. Without committing ourselves to all his speculations, we may call attention to the sincerity and right-mindedness of his purpose. It is rare to find political disquisitions addressed solely as an endeavour to bring the purest morals to bear upon the regulation and adjustment of our social duties, as a corollary from the first and higher duty, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God 'with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind,' the spring and source of all happiness, present and future. Mr. Heathfield considers that what is called the Peel policy has led to the great prosperity now enjoyed throughout the empire; and as this prosperity is coincident with the development of principles essentially just and beneficent in operation, and which in act and deed reflect the light of truth, and, in as far as they be just, make manifest the wisdom which is from above, social justice—or righteousness, so reduced to practice, and not preserved in theory only—cannot be a scheme unfit for the consideration or, if need be, the cooperation of the minister of the Gospel. He instances the case of clandestine trade, and especially that of the Clergyman—in a parish of notorious smugglers.

Mr. Henry Drummond's 'Reply to the Rev. R. J. Wilberforce's Principles of Church Authority,' (Bosworth,) is as vigorous as we should expect everything to be which proceeded from his pen. Had he confined himself to the destructive portion of his work, his book would have been very telling: but the constructive parts take off the force of the others. When we find ourselves referred to government by Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, and Pastors, as the instrument for preserving unity in the Church, our feeling is rather that of *incredulus odi* than of conviction. We give two or three extracts, as specimens of his style:—'The Bishops of the Roman sect act 'like Railway-directors, tell all to get into the carriages, not to trouble 'themselves about the generation and condensation of steam, the proba-'bilities of accidents, or any other contingencies; but to have faith that 'somehow or other they will arrive at their journey's end.'—P. 144. 'The 'most extraordinary assertion on this page 91, is, that "through the minis-'try of the Bishops the Apostles still sit upon Twelve Thrones judging the 'Twelve Tribes of Israel." First: the Apostles are in their graves, and 'not sitting upon thrones anywhere. Secondly: there are no thrones to 'sit upon until the restoration of the kingdom of Israel. Thirdly: the 'Bishops exercise no authority over the Twelve Tribes of Israel, although 'the Popes for many centuries past have treated and continue to treat all 'the Jews who are resident in Rome with brutal barbarity.'—P. 54. 'In 'p. 50 he says, "The members of Christ answer to the seed of Adam: 'Christ is incarnate in history because he was incarnate in His flesh." 'Again in p. 66 he says, "In this work" (*i. e.* building the Church), "the

Digitized by Google

'Apostle had borne the first labours, and through them did He, whom they 'had seen incarnate in the flesh, become mystically incarnate in the con- 'gregation.' Incarnation in history, is neither more nor less than rank 'nonsense. Incarnation in the congregation is the same. God uniting 'human flesh to himself, so that God and man are united in one 'Person, is Incarnation; and to nothing else in heaven or in earth is the 'word applicable.'—P. 41. He has pointed out some incorrect theological statements on the part of Mr. Wilberforce, and several historical misrepresentations. He has himself made a confusion between 'Froude's Remains' and his brother's 'Nemesis of Faith.' (P. 181.) The latter part of the book consists of a history of the iniquities of the Popes from the Tenth to Sixteenth century, related often in the very words of the ancient authorities. But Mr. Drummond does not confine himself to attacking the popes: *more suo*, he strikes a blow at every one as he passes along. But we cannot dismiss Mr. Drummond without a word of special remonstrance. Mr. Drummond has, we believe, according to his distinct convictions, a solemn and awful office in this, the Church of Christ. No matter to us what Mr. Drummond believes to be the Church. The more he disparages the rest of the brethren, the more he ought to estimate the Saviour's home in his own conventicle; the more he ought to be careful of speech and language, as himself the almost solitary sharer of the great secret and purpose of the Most High. Just as much as he vilifies us ought he to respect himself; if, as he tells us, p. 141, 'it is true of all Christen- 'dom that there is no church, no body, no temple, no kingdom, no army of 'Christ's; that there is [*sic*] in all the sects of Christendom many individual 'believers, but that is not a church,' &c. &c.; 'if all that we are told 'about the body of Christ and the indwelling Spirit has no sense, nor 'meaning, nor practical operation, but amongst a set of people despised by 'all, amongst whom, nevertheless, God is preparing a body throughout 'Christendom which shall shortly be translated to meet the Lord in the 'air;' (p. 180,)—that is to say, if there is no visible church of Christ upon earth except hidden in his own scanty religious community; and if this community is on the very point of consummating the great ingathering of the harvest of souls, how careful in speech, how pure in thought, how anxious lest unconsciously he make one of Christ's little ones to offend, should he especially be who bears his the highest office among the true believers. This, however, is Mr. Drummond's own affair: what concerns us is not whether Mr. Drummond's ordinary aspect towards English society, especially in the House of Commons, is or is not consistent with his personal claims; but we must say, that Mr. Drummond's peculiar taste in collecting together, and copying out, and parading and extracting obscenities and indecencies, is a serious offence in the eyes of common decency. No doubt it is an argument which has its weight against the particular claims of the See of Rome, that its pontiffs have been men of immoral lives. But there is more than one way of stating this objection. Mr. Drummond has, in this publication, to the extent of ten pages, raked together into one hideous compost of abomination all the crimes and vices which, truly or falsely, have at various times been objected, in the coarsest language, against the Popes and Roman Clergy; and whenever Mr. Drummond writes, he

Digitized by Google

pursues this hateful subject in the same hateful way. Against this unhappy habit of mind we protest. On minor points we know that a remonstrance would be useless: otherwise it were tempting to inquire what right, moral or other, the mystagogues of Gordon Square have to complain of the assumption by others of 'priestly power?' or why the devotees of the most extravagant and pedantic ritualism in existence, should affect to scorn questions about altars and surplices, lights and flowers in churches, and the like?

The 'Californian Crusoe,' (J. H. Parker,) is much better as regards purpose than execution. We consider it overcharged, and at the same time dull. If there is any evidence for connecting the Jesuits with Mormonism, let it be produced. But so serious a charge ought not to be embodied in a fictitious narrative merely to give zest to a tedious narrative.

'Leonard and Dennis,' (Masters,) 'a Tale of the present War,' is rather a collection of tales; at least, the various plots seem to have a very slight connexion. It exhibits some strong and effective writing, but little dramatic skill.

'Mother and Son, a Tale,' (J. W. Parker,) is clever and forcibly written. It is the first specimen of a series, 'Tales for the People,' and owns the authorship, we believe, of Mr. Paget. Its successor, 'The Strike,' is common-place.

Miss Sophia Brooks has printed 'Twenty-one Verses, recommending Boys' Borough Schools upon a more extensive scale.' (Palmer.) As a curiosity in more ways than one, we extract some of these verses. The boys are to be taught—

'To learn about the fields, the herds of kine and sheep,
From books of simple husbandry, for future labour mete;
The names of tools of husbandry, and uses if they can:
The lad who daily goes to school must strive to be a man.

'Must learn to fully know each varied sort of wood;
This tends to what is great, and real essential good;
For carpenters and shipbuilders ne'er failing to agree,
The ship or floor to have been once a sturdy forest tree.

'The rudiments of gard'ning could amply here be taught,
It draws the mind towards fresher scenes, of finer active thought:
The time, the proper time, to sow each vegetable seed,
The time to prune the branches in, lest a hasty lop recede.

'The properties and qualities, of iron, tin, and lead,
Before the sight of ruder youth could easily be spread;
Because too soon they oft get sent apprentice lads to be:
'Tis neither wise, nor is it kind to sow perplexity.

'With sorrow let us speak of the reckless use of steam;
You catch a whizzing sound, and then a fever scream.
Oh! for visions less distracting, and needs be less appalling,
Than human brains destroy'd, and mangl'd bodies falling.

Digitized by Google

'O, learn of colours light, of triple kinds of gasses;
Learn how to use the dye, to clean the knighthood sashes;
Slate quarries and coal mines, could rouse a vacant mind,
And fit it to endure, work of a heavier kind.

'Most growing children need health in the midst of rule!
As growing infants will, and exercise in school;
A run or skip at morn and eve, could easily be found,
If added to the Borough School a copious yard or ground.

'A large and full height school, with water well supplied;
Not costly all without, and artificial pomp inside:
But that which must be had, have in sufficient store;
Pens, books, slates, ink, and over-funds for whatsoever more.'
Pp. 13—15.

'Compline, after the Use of Sarum,' (Hayes,) is a useful manual for private use, taken from authentic sources.

Cardinal Wiseman's 'Fabiola, a Tale of the Catacombs,' (Burns & Lambert,) is a touching tale, exhibiting great skill in composition, and consummate knowledge in the history of the Primitive Church. The monuments and life of the early Church are exhibited in a story of deep pathos: and, as it is written in accordance with the doctrine of development, there is scarcely anything inconsistent with the convictions of an English Churchman in the volume.

'The Palace,' (Bosworth,) is a little brochure—from internal evidence we pronounce it to be by Mr. White, a clever architect of the day—which contains, in the shape of the writer's impressions on the opening of the Crystal Palace, some careful hints on the subject of colour. Mr. White has a theory—some will call it a crotchet—on the proportions of buildings. In the Crystal Palace he finds a multiple of some number. This is true of every shed. He observes that 'there is *historical evidence* of the Egyptian artists, at least, having set out all their work by squares.' There is pictorial, and in this sense historical, evidence that Egyptian draftsmen, in copying a design, used a ground-plan of lines intersecting each other into equal squares; which is exactly what engravers and copyists do in reproducing a picture at the present day. But the process is merely mechanical, and founded upon no laws of proportion.

Bishop Selwyn's 'Four University Sermons,' (Macmillan,) only require an acknowledgment at our hands. They are, we are convinced, in the possession and in the hearts of all our readers.

In 'English: Past and Present,' (J. W. Parker,) we are presented with a brief yet interesting set of five Lectures, not very consecutive, on the changes of the English language, the elements of which it is composed, and certain of its archaisms, and the secondary and derived senses of words. These Lectures were delivered to Mr. Trench's class in King's College, and exhibit much information in philology and etymology, not drily put, but illustrated by the author's elegant and multifarious reading. These

Digitized by Google

are studies which very much interest the young; the unexpectedness of the derivation of a word, and its lurking affinities of meaning, seem to attract those mental faculties which in childhood are applied to games of chance and puzzles. This little work must be read in connexion with the writer's previous publication, 'On the Study of Words.'

'The Seven Ages of a Christian's Life, (Rivingtons,) is a meditation of a very common-place character, on the different stages of human life, connected, in some way which we are unable to discover, with Shakspere's Seven Ages. It is by the Dean of Norwich. Speaking of youth, Dr. Pellew observes (p. 11),—'The Church justly concludes, that at the age of 'fifteen or sixteen years the children of Christian parents become . . . en-'titled to a nearer approach, &c. after receiving the holy rite of con-'firmation.' We are unable to discover this conclusion of the Church. The Church requires children to be confirmed, as soon as they can say three short formularies; and although this order is by some of our Bishops construed to mean at the age of sixteen, yet the construction is a very recent one. Nicholas Ferrar was confirmed at the age of six years; and, as we find from Bishops Hacket and Taylor, it was the custom of those days to admit children at a very early age to confirmation and communion.

A second edition of 'Lent Readings from the Fathers,' (J. H. Parker,) compiled by Mr. Bennett, and recommended by Dr. Pusey, will, perhaps, if ever reasonably read, teach gainsayers what depths of spiritual and practical religion are to be found in writings which they are disposed only from ignorance to condemn and disparage.

Of a like tendency,—that is, to simple edification,—we welcome Mr. H. Dunwell's 'Lectures on the Psalms.' (J. H. Parker.) They are composed chiefly of the thoughts and running commentaries of S. Augustine, and the early Fathers: and they embrace the first twenty-four Psalms, the xlv. and cx. By the way, Theodoret has no claim to the title of Saint.

'The Golden Spell, and other Poems.' (Exeter: Holden.) This collection has reached a second edition, and exhibits considerable thought. The writer would, we think, do well to cultivate simplicity: there is a depth of meaning in many of his poems which exhausts the attention, and we are free to confess that we cannot always fathom him. He composes on a theory, which, if we are sometimes unable to appreciate,—perhaps we had better say, to understand,—we can award him our conviction that it has enabled him to give us a volume which is on the whole of high promise.

Dr. Townsend, of Durham, has taken some pains to accomplish a work which some of our readers may believe might as well have been left undone. In his 'Flowers from the Garden of the Church,' (J. H. Parker,) he has turned all the Prayer Book Collects into verse. We suppose there is something in the air of Durham which makes this sort of ingenious labour indigenous. Sir George Wheler, who turned the English Communion office into heroic verse, &c. was a prebendary of Durham; and Dr. Tye, the organist, who did 'the Acts of the Apostles into English metre,' was, we think, connected with the same church.

Digitized by Google

The third, and, as it turns out, the concluding part of the work, undertaken, we believe, by Mr. Isaac Taylor, 'The Restoration of Belief,' (Macmillan,) has appeared. It hurries to a conclusion; and presses as a summary argument against modern infidelity, the argument from the Miracles. It confronts unbelief, changing as it is in character and vacillating in purpose, on a single issue, that of the Miracles of the Gospel. The present writer does not consider the argument from the Miracles in its common aspect, as a mere series of supernatural events, isolated in their purpose, and unconsequential beyond a single object, that of 'launching a new religion in the world, and for giving it an initial impulse' on its first and unwilling hearers; but he considers that the Miracles have a permanent and prolonged purpose, and have special and eternal relations with all the objects of the scheme of salvation. Superficial readers might, and not unreasonably, be alarmed at the somewhat meagre enumeration of these objects of the Saviour's mission, in which that of propitiation for sin and His sacrifice as a vicarious atonement, appears to hold a very ill-defined if even a palpable position. But Mr. Taylor's object must be borne in mind: he takes up disbelief at its own account of itself; and at p. 318, he plainly professes his distinct belief in all the articles of the Nicene Creed. We do not share in the writer's anticipations, but his view has not often been better expressed than in these words:—

'I look forward to a time when national distinctions of race, language, 'and geographical location shall continually be melting away, at least so 'far as they may ultimately be obstructive of the brotherhood of the human 'family. That centralization—apart from universal *empire*—which a true 'understanding of the conditions of social well-being tends to bring about, 'and which it is now in the course of bringing about, is, I think, embraced 'or implied throughout the prophetic writings. On the same grounds I look 'for a future time when Right for the many, or, better expressed, when 'RIGHT for ALL, shall be the sovereign and irresistible principle in every 'community. As to Right for the *many*, it has taken to itself a conven-'tional meaning, which differs little, if at all, from a periodic overthrow of 'society, such as may give the undermost class their time of plunder. But 'RIGHT for ALL, means social *stability*; and this one idea of STABILITY, as 'opposed to anarchy and to periodic convulsions, meets us everywhere on 'the prophetic pages. Then, as the consequence of this my first anticipa-'tion, I look for a time when the material welfare, or, as we say, the 'earthly and daily comfort and enjoyment of the many—or let us rather 'say of all, so that we may exclude that banditti meaning which radicalism 'clings to—when this well-doing for all—this secure holding of the most 'needful things of life, shall be so much thought of as shall in fact realize 'it in a continually more and more complete manner. Between the two 'cooperative influences of an iron sense of right and justice on the one 'hand, and of humanizing and soft-hearted sympathies on the other, an 'intense feeling shall pervade the social mass, under the operation of 'which, want—still incident as it must be to man—and squalor, and house-'less discomfort, and, what is worse, cellared wretchedness, and disease—'the child of filth shall always be in process of sublimation, and shall be 'driven off, as one may say, from the social mass, by its high internal

Digitized by Google

'temperature. A strong feeling of uneasiness at the sight or thought of 'privation and bodily misery shall be always ridding the world of these 'ever-recurrent evils. I look for a time, not fabulous and impossible—not 'rosy and celestial, but earthlike and sunny, when every man—absolutely 'secure from violence, and moderately at ease, shall sit in home style 'under, or near to, as he likes best, his vine and fig-tree, none daring, or 'even wishing, to make him afraid. I do not look for a time on this earth 'when there shall be no surgeons' work—no hospitals, no infirmaries, no 'police; but I do believe in an age of individual and domestic bliss, such 'as is pictured in some sweet odes and stirring paragraphs of my Bible. 'I believe in a time yet to come, when HE who—eternal shame upon 'Manichees, upon Ascetics, upon Fanatics of all sorts—"manifested His 'glory" first, by being a willing guest at a wedding, and then and there 'showing that Creation is His own—when HE shall bless the world by 'bringing at once His iron sceptre of righteousness and His law of love 'to bear upon the *temporal* good of all men. I look for a time when He 'who is "King of Peace" and "King of Righteousness," shall rule the 'nations under both titles; and when, as a consequence of the establish-'ment of uncontradicted Truth and of Reason, safe from sophistry, and of 'Right, bowed to and enforced, there shall be abundance of earthly felicity, 'to last until this planet has wound up its destined story.

'In the course of those events that have marked the years of this cur-'rent century—that is to say, those *ostensible* matters which history takes 'account of—I scarcely discern any indications of the coming on of such 'an era of mundane welfare. One may imagine, to-day, that things are 'taking a turn in this better direction; but to-morrow (as so many past 'to-morrows have done) will perhaps scatter every supposition of the sort, 'and break it up as a dream. But though the evolving fortunes of 'nations do not clearly, if at all, foreshow the golden age at hand, yet it is 'true that those who have been watching the unrecorded movements of 'the human mind—in Europe, throughout these fifty years, and who have 'been used to let down a line into the under-current, and have noted its 'shiftings, have come to think that those preparations—intellectual, moral, 'and political—which would be the proper precursors of a new and better 'era, have not only had a commencement, but have been making progress 'at a rapid rate.'—Pp. 208—311.

Here, too, is a fine passage on the belief in the Resurrection from the dead:—

'In the first place then, an unhesitating belief of the resurrection of 'Christ—if I allow the meditative faculty to dwell upon it—leads me forth 'from a region of interminable surmises that are comfortless, appalling, or 'worse; and it brings me upon a ground that is firm to the foot, and 'where those objects that are already familiar to me, stand out distinctly, 'and are sharply defined; and they show themselves, not in the glimmer 'or in the blaze of a vague phosphorescence, but in the every-day sober sun-'light of this present world. If I carry myself back, as I may easily do, 'to that Garden under the walls of Jerusalem wherein was a sepulchre, or 'enter an upper chamber, within the city, or go on to a house a Sabbath-

Digitized by Google

'day's journey, south of it; or travel so far as to the shore of the lake of 'Galilee; if I go thither taking with me no haze of exaggeration, I there 'find HIM who is at once the Representative of the human family, and its 'Sponsor; and I find Him such after the suffering of death, as He was 'before it—save his recent scars. The immortality, therefore, which is 'held before me in the Christian scheme, is no such a thing as a nucleus of 'conscious mist, floating about in a golden fog, amid millions of the same 'purposeless, limbless sparks. It is an immortality of organized material 'energies;—it is the same welded mind-and-matter human nature—fitted 'for service—apt to labour, and capable of all those experiences, and fur- 'nished for all those enterprises, and armed for those endurances, which, 'seeing that they are thus provided for, and are, as one may say, thus 'foreshown in the Christian resurrection, put before me a rational solution '—hypothetic indeed, and yet not illusory—of those now immanent trials, 'of those hard experiences, of those frustrated labours, and of those fiery 'sufferings, the passing through which so much perplexes and disheartens 'me now; but which at once find their reason when I see them in their 'intention, as the needed schooling for an immortality in the endless for- 'tunes of which this mind-and-matter structure shall have room to show 'what things it can do and bear, and what enterprises of love it shall 'devise, and shall bring to a happy consummation, it may be, cycles of 'centuries hence.

'"The Lord is risen indeed!" said those simple souls, one to another, 'in that dim morning hour—which was the morning of a Day Eternal to 'human nature; and He so rises as to throw forward upon the path of 'this human nature, to the remotest range of an endless existence, a steady 'light of reality.

'Over against this reasonable and conceivable CHRISTIAN IDEA of the 'future life, as it is set before me in the instance of the Resurrection 'of Christ, I will put the dreamy Elysium of classical antiquity—I will put 'the sensualisms of the oriental beliefs—I will put the wearisome and 'vapid inanities of modern poetical or philosophical surmises:—yes, and 'over against this genuine belief I must put those more consistent sup- 'positions which, at this present time, are presenting themselves, in 'a whisper, as probable, if we are to follow the guidance of psychological 'speculation, and if we are looking to such a future existence as the 'analogy of things around us might suggest. As compared with all such 'anticipations—more or less consonant as they may severally be with 'facts known to us—I find that my Christian Belief is more consistent 'than any one of them, is more realizable—is more cheering, is more 'animating, and that it is of a tendency (when rightly considered) the most 'healthful, as to the moral and the intellectual faculties.'—Pp. 341—344.

In some respects on the same subject, but with less of a philosophic spirit, and yet with considerable practical shrewdness and plainness of speech and language, Mr. R. W. Morgan publishes his 'Christianity and Modern Infidelity compared.' (Rivingtons.) Mr. Morgan, we think, had better have avoided the dialogue form, which Mr. Rogers, in his celebrated 'Eclipse of Faith,' has treated with such skill. In Mr Morgan's hands,

Digitized by Google

the dialogue is not conducted with that deep Socratic irony which refutes an opponent by his own admissions, and which compels his reluctant witness to the truth. 'The Infidel' in Mr. Morgan's book only stands up to put his worst and most assailable arguments. However, Mr. Morgan writes in a clear and popular way; and his arguments are always intelligibly and intelligently put. His own principles are sound; and for general purposes he has furnished a useful manual, which is highly creditable to his argumentative powers. — From the same writer we have received two other publications—we decline to specify them—one relating to his own grievances and alleged wrongs; the other consisting of a very stirring appeal against the sins and errors of the administration of the Church in Wales. Whether the latter protest is not the result of Mr. Morgan's own position we shall not here say; and with respect to his case we must decline to give an opinion on an *ex parte* statement. This much, however, we can afford to say,—that the state of things which permits either the charge made by Mr. Morgan, or the charge made against Mr. Morgan, to stand as it appears to stand, merely as a charge uninvestigated, and therefore of course unrefuted, is the heaviest possible censure of that system of clerical discipline which Dr. Maitland is so surprised that we are Quixotic enough to think that even a body so ineffective as Convocation might mend; or at least try to mend.

It is not often that we see the sermons of English Churchmen in French. We have, however, had forwarded to us a very good French Sermon on the Conversion of Zacchæus, by the Rev. F. Godfray. It was first printed in 'L'Ami de la Religion, ou, Messager Evangélique des Iles de la Manche,' (Jersey: Gosset; London: Masters,) which we have already taken occasion to commend.

Mr. Claude Magnay has published a volume of Sermons, (Masters,) which he designates as 'Practical and Suggestive.' All that they suggest to us is the question, why they were printed. As we looked through the volume we had hopes of the writer: the Sermons are certainly not so bad as the Preface.

Mr. Harvey Goodwin's 'Four University Sermons,' delivered during the present spring, (Deighton,) make us thankful that such really sound and impressive cautions should be addressed to undergraduates from a Cambridge pulpit. This is the valuable part of the sermons: in their doctrinal aspect we see, or fancy that we see, the amiable object of conciliation somewhat overruling the sterner and more rigid duties of the preacher. It is with something like *naïveté* that on one occasion Mr. Goodwin expresses great surprise that, with reference to some of his speculations on the Temptation, 'no trace of it is to be found in such of the Fathers as I have been able to consult.'—P. 146. Mr. Goodwin, however, falls back on the countenance which his views receive from Mr. Farmer, a dissenting minister, and a pupil of Dr. Doddridge. We are surprised, in the fourth Sermon, to find the preacher arguing that the petition in the Litany, 'In all time of our wealth,' referred to 'temptations from being rich in silver and gold.'

Digitized by Google

A single sermon, of considerable power, 'The Year that King Ahaz died,' (Rivingtons,) is by Professor Claughton, and puts very nicely the social and political, and therefore the religious, lesson to be drawn from the death of the Emperor Nicholas.

A set of 'Practical Sermons,' published by Masters, on the Old Testament Saints, we can speak of with entire approval. The sermons on Scripture characters have, and very undeservedly, been too much lost sight of.

A series of 'Papers and Sermons on the War,' (Rivingtons,) is in course of publication. 'A Manual of Prayers for the Wounded'—'Sermon to the Wounded'—'Sermon to the Dying'—'Sermon to those at Home,' are before us, and we can speak highly of them. With all the complaints which are urged, and too often, we believe, for selfish and party purposes, our conviction is that no British, or any other Christian, army ever went upon active service so amply provided with temporal and spiritual appliances as that now serving in the Crimea; and therefore no war has been conducted under auspices so hopeful.

Digitized by Google

INDEX TO VOL. XXIX.

(NEW SERIES.)

ARTICLES AND SUBJECTS.

C.

Cathedral Reform [*Commissioners' Report*, &c.], 332—368. Exclusive interest attached to parochial Clergy, 332. Estimate of capitular property, 333. The Ecclesiastical Commission, 1835, 334. History of the Cathedrals, 338. Chapters, 339 At the Reformation, 343. Reform, so called, of 1835, 344. Present needs and prospects, 344—368.

Clergy, Education of the [*Report of Cathedral Commissioners*, &c.], 192—214. Diocesan Colleges, 192. Work expected of the Universities, 193. Dr. Heurtley, 193. Dr. Ogilvie, 194. University lectures, 196. Parties in the Church, 198. Separate Classes, 202. Wells College, 205. Education wanted for Students in Theology apart from the University, 207—214.

D.

De Quincey [*Selections*, &c.], 155—191. Autobiography, 155. Of infancy, 156. The Author's style, 157. De Quincey's childhood, 158. His sister, 160. His brother, 163—168. Boyhood, 169. At school, 171. The world, 172. London, 174, 175. The author at fifteen, 177. Lady Carbery, 178. The writer's character, 180—183. Wordsworth, Southey, and Coleridge, 174—191.

Dury, Calixtus, and the Peacemakers [*Calixtus und seine Zeit*, &c.], 1—49. Syncretism, 2. State of Germany, 3. Of the Lutherans, 4—6. Calixtus, 7. External aspect of Lutherans, 8; in Sweden, 9; and elsewhere, 10, 11. The Feast of the Reformation, 12. The Lutheran fast days, 13. The Reformed, 14. Dury, 15—29. Calixtus, 29—45. Other attempts at pacification, 46—49.

F.

Faber, George Stanley, [*Many Mansions*, &c.], 310—331. A controversialist, 311. His birth, 312. His career at Oxford, 313. Marriage, 314. He is ordained, 315. Preferment, 315. Sherburn Hospital, 316. His character, 317; and literary tastes, 318. His illness and death, 320, 321. His theology, 322. His "Many Mansions," 324—331.

M.

Mahometanism [*Möhler on Islam*, &c.], 83—154. Increasing interest on the subject, 83. Classical writers on the subject, 84. Other authorities, 85—87. Möhler, 88. Caussin, 89. Ubicini, 90. Dr. Newman, 91—93. State of Arabia at the era of Mahomet, 94. Arab characteristics, 95—105. Anticipations of Mahometanism, 106. Life of Mahomet, 107. Was he an impostor? 108—113. Möhler's view, 114, 115. Character of his religion, 116—154.

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister [*Letters by Dr. Hessey. Messrs. Beresford Hope, Keble*, &c.], 458—477. Argument from Scripture, 458. Sense of Levit. xviii. 7—17, 459—467. Table of prohibited Degrees, 468. The testimony of the Ancient Church, 470—472. Maimonides, 473. Conclusion, 475—477.

O.

Ottomans, the early [*Von Hammer's History of the Ottomans*, &c.], 225—309. Present interest in the Ottomans, 225, 226. Von Hammer, 227. His French translator, 228. The Turkomans, 229. Family of Seljouk, 230. Othman, 232—238. Orchan, 239—247. The

Digitized by Google

Janissaries, 248—254. Orchan's reign and death, 255—258. Amurath, 259—269. Bajazet, 270. Battle of Nicopolis, 271—273. Reign of Bajazet, 274—277. Timour, 278. Battle of Angora, 279. Bajazet, a prisoner, dies, 283. Sons of Bajazet and disputed succession, 288. Revival of the Ottoman power under Mahomet, 286—288. Amurath II., 289—302. Mahomet the Conquaror, 302. Fall of Constantinople, 303—309.

P.

Plurality of Worlds [*An Essay*, &c. *Answer by Sir D. Brewster*, &c.], 50—82. Dr. Whewell, the author, 50. The reply, 52. Position of the Earth in the Universe, 54—60. Analysis of Dr. Whewell's work, 61—77. Sir D. Brewster's Work, 78—80. Conclusion, 81, 82.

W.

Wilberforce on the Supremacy [*Inquiry into the Principles of Church-authority*, &c.], 369—457. No novelty in Mr. Wilberforce's work, 369. Its bitter spirit, 370. Church authority, 371. Councils, 372. Mr. Wilberforce's four propositions, 373. Was S. Peter, by Divine appointment, the centre of unity? 374—403. Was the Bishop of Rome the centre of unity to the early Church? 404—417. Was the Primacy a Supremacy? 418—443. The position of the English Church at the Reformation, 444—452. The Greek Church. 453, 454. Conclusion, 455—457.

Digitized by Google

SHORTER NOTICES OF BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

JANUARY.—Early History of the Primacy of Armagh—Heartsease, or, the Brother's Wife—Letter to Mr. Dale—Bishop of Winchester on Convocation—Educational Prospects of S. Thomas, Charterhouse—Truths Maintained—The Church and her Destinies—The Castle Builders—Recent Forms of Prayer—Professor Ansted's Scenery, Science, and Artist—Baker's Northamptonshire Glossary—Late Payment of Weekly Wages—Murray's Railway Reading—Bishop of Oxford's Charge—Classic Texts—Stories and Lessons on the Catechism—Analysis of the Revelation—Archdeacon Denison's Statement of his Case—Grueber on Art. XXIX.—Gresley on the Unity of the Church—Wilberforce on the Royal Supremacy—Newland's 'Postils'—Meyrick's Two University Sermons.

APRIL.—Ramsay's Catechisms—Newland's Norway—Public Nurseries—Instrumenta Ecclesiastica—Parker's Scripture Prints—Journal of Philology—Calvin's Letters—Mulready's Vicar of Wakefield—Goodwin's Guide to the Parish Church—Harvey on the Creeds—Procter on the Common Prayer—Hill's Letter to Dr. Barrow—The Cross and the Dragon—Freeman on the Church Services—Work for National Schools—Poems on the War—Burgon's Memorial of Dr. Routh—Arnold's Horace—Richard's Champion—Heathcote on the Catechism—Hawkins' Family Prayers—Marriott's Poems—Barrett's Latin Grammar—Sharpe on the Bible—Life of Nicholas Ferrar—On the Holy Communion—Apology for Secular Recreations—Sermon on Immaculate Conception—Convocation and Church Services—New Edition of Hume and Smollett—Month in Portugal—Whately's Thoughts—Observance of Sunday—Foulkes' Pamphlet—Old Church Porch—Schnorr's Bible Prints—French Architectural Dictionary—Maitland on Convocation—Church Thoughts—Rogers on Marriage Question—Conington's Inaugural Lecture—Ellicott on the Galatians—Ken on the Creed—Trench on Conversation—Thorndike on the Eucharist—Wright's Catena—Clewer House of Mercy—Memorials of Canterbury—Sermons by Marriott and Harvey—Heathfield's Essays—Godfray's Sermon—Drummond's Reply to Wilberforce—Californian Crusoe—Leonard and Dennis—Mother and Son—The Strike—Brooks' Verses—Sarum Compline—Fabiola—The Palace—Bishop Selwyn's Sermons—English: Past and Present—Seven Ages—Lent Readings—Dunwell on the Psalms—The Golden Spell—Townshend on the Collects—The Restoration of Belief—Morgan on Infidelity—Sermons by Godfray, Magnay, Goodwin, Claughton—Practical Sermons—War Tracts, &c.

R. CLAY, PRINTER, BREAD STREET HILL.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google